

to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 86. A bill to increase the salary of Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 87. A bill to establish the seniority status of employees in the field postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 88. A bill to change the designations of certain positions in the postal field service and Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 89. A bill to provide for flood-control improvements on Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 90. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the State to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 91. A bill to repeal the taxes on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 92. A bill to reduce the rate of tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 93. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose certain duties upon the importation of tuna fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 94. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the federally owned lands which are situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla., to the army board, State of Florida, in order to consolidate ownership and perpetuate the availability of Camp Blanding for military training and use; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 95. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States for that portion of the construction cost of certain schools which is attributable to Negroes and Indians; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 96. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 97. A bill to amend section 4 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to extend to certain medical personnel credit for military service rendered in the armed forces of belligerent nations during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 98. A bill providing for distribution of certain funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 99. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 100. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the former owners of mineral interests in certain lands in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana acquired by the United States under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 101. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that annuities received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 102. A bill to prohibit certain reservations of mineral interests by Federal land banks, the Land Bank Commissioner, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Association, and to

provide for disposition of certain mineral interests heretofore reserved by them; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 103. A bill making it unlawful for any person for himself or for any corporation, firm, partnership, or association, to accept any fee, service charge, or any other thing of value for the purpose of securing a position for any person in the Government of the United States, or the Armed Forces, or position in any construction work, civil or military, which is financed in whole or in part by the Government of the United States, or a position on any construction work upon which the United States Government has extended any loan, or who for a fee, service charge, or any other thing of value undertakes to use his influence with Government agents in securing a loan from any agency of the Government, providing a penalty for the violation thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 104. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of the Standing Rock Reservation in North and South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 105. A bill to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 106. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn \$100 a month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 107. A bill to provide for the transfer of the site of the original Fort Buford, N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 108. A bill to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 109. A bill making it unlawful for any Member of the Congress of the United States of America to receive or accept any part of the salary, directly or indirectly, of any person employed by him in the discharge of his official duties whose compensation is paid by the United States, providing a penalty therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 110. A bill to authorize the cancellation, adjustment, and collection of certain obligations due the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 111. A bill to provide for uniforms for employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 112. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 113. A bill to provide marketing quotas for certain agricultural commodities measured in terms of quantity rather than acreage, to establish a program of price support based on such quotas, to provide that such commodities may be marketed in excess of such quotas without penalty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLESCN:

H. R. 114. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 115. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 116. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the transportation of fireworks into any State in which the sale of such fireworks is prohibited; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 117. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from \$600 to \$1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 118. A bill to assist individuals to provide financial security upon retirement and to make provisions for surviving members of their families by allowing an income-tax deduction for premiums paid on annuity and life-insurance contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 119. A bill to provide that certain amounts expended by individuals for the purchase of non-interest-bearing United States bonds may be deducted in computing net income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 120. A bill to permit the postponement of income tax with respect to a portion of earned net income paid to a restricted retirement fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 121. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission to investigate and make recommendations with respect to the distribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue within the framework of our Federal, State, and local systems of government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 122. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide full annuities, for individuals who have completed 30 years of service; to provide annuities thereunder equal to one-half the average monthly compensation on the basis of the 5 years of highest earnings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 123. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River development, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 124. A bill to abolish the Lakeview Federal sustained-yield unit, Fremont National Forest, Ore.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 125. A bill to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 126. A bill to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 127. A bill to quitclaim interest of the United States to certain land in Placer County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 128. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the 5-year limitation on the time for presenting Indian claims to the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 129. A bill to provide funds for co-operation with the public-school authorities of Valencia County, N. Mex., in the construction and improvement of public-school facilities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 184. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain property of the United States Government (in Windsor Locks, Conn.) to the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 185. A bill to provide certain additional benefits for members of the National Guard of the United States who suffer disability or death while engaged in active-training duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 186. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance payable to rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 187. A bill to terminate the war-tax rate on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 188. A bill to terminate the war-tax rate on admissions to theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 189. A bill to terminate all ceilings and controls on meats and livestock; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 190. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery in western Oklahoma; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 191. A bill authorizing an appropriation to aid the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College in establishing an experimental farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 192. A bill to provide for national recognition of Adelaide Johnson, the sculptor of The Woman's Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 193. A bill to provide for national recognition of Adelaide Johnson, the sculptor of The Woman's Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 194. A bill to authorize research work in weed control, grass culture, and soil-fertility maintenance at Panhandle Agricultural and Mechanical College, Goodwell, Okla.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 195. A bill to establish a temporary commission to investigate the costs and effects of watershed programs for flood control in agricultural watersheds; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 196. A bill to extend the time within which claims may be presented to the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 197. A bill to provide for a minimum price support for the 1953 crop of peanuts at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 198. A bill to increase the minimum level of price support for the 1953 cotton crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 199. A bill to increase the special pay of enlisted persons of the uniformed services for sea and foreign duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 200. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the initial phase of the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 201. A bill to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 202. A bill making an appropriation for the Washita Valley flood-prevention program in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 203. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide that a railroad employee who has completed 30 years of service may retire on a full annuity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 204. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with respect to the procurement of supplies from small business concerns; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 205. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 206. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 207. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 208. A bill to provide for compensation to blind persons for loss of earning power due to blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 209. A bill to authorize the remodeling and extension of the existing main post-office building and to construct a new post-office building in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 210. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the protection of the Bald Eagle," approved June 8, 1940; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 211. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building in the Piedmont district in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 212. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building in the Montavilla district in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 213. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building in the Rose City Park district, in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 214. A bill to provide for a study and survey as the basis for the establishment of publicly owned natural grassland areas, to assure the preservation of typical areas of each of the major grasslands types, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 215. A bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 216. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with certain organizations to carry out the functions of the Poundmaster of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 217. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 218. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health-service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 219. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 220. A bill to repeal the Immigration and Nationality Act (Public Law 414, 82d Cong.) and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 221. A bill to require the Attorney General to compile and maintain a list of subversive organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 222. A bill to amend paragraph 207 and schedule 16 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 223. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 224. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in the southern portion of Louisiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 225. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the criminal penalty provided for persons convicted of gathering or delivering certain defense information to aid a foreign government in time of peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 226. A bill to provide for the detention and prosecution of Communists and former Communists, to provide that peacetime espionage may be punished by death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 227. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 228. A bill to authorize the coinage of special 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana Territory from France by President Jefferson in 1803; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 229. A bill to incorporate the Board for Fundamental Education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 230. A bill to incorporate the United Mexican Border Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 231. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951 to provide for the termination of assistance to any nation which does not make a full contribution to the development and maintenance of the defensive strength of the free world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 232. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 233. A bill to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land in Marion County, Ind.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 234. A bill to encourage the prevention of water pollution by allowing amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 235. A bill to amend section 22 (d) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 236. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Frypan-Arkansas project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 237. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt home workers in rural areas from the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of that act in certain cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 238. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for

H. R. 288. A bill to provide for the creation of a Board of Analysis for Engineering and Architectural Projects and Drainage Area Advisory Commissions, in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 289. A bill creating a Veterans' Insurance Corporation in the Veterans' Administration to exercise all of the functions with respect to Government life insurance and national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 290. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Veterans' Administration in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 291. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Department of the Treasury in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 292. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 293. A bill to effectuate recommendations relating to the Department of the Interior of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 294. A bill to expand the activities of the Department of Commerce in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 295. A bill to place in the Administrator of General Services responsibility for coordination of certain miscellaneous activities in the District of Columbia in accordance with a recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 296. A bill to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 297. A bill making various changes in laws applicable to the Post Office Department in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 298. A bill to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government, and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 299. A bill to establish principles and policies to govern generally the management of the executive branch of the Government in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 300. A bill to establish a Department of Social Security and Education in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 301. A bill to establish and to consolidate certain hospital, medical, and public-health functions of the Government in a Department of Health; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 302. A bill to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 303. A bill to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 304. A bill to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia of certain citizens of the United States adjudged insane in foreign countries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 305. A bill to allow a widow or widower to deduct, for income-tax purposes, amounts paid in providing for the care of children while the taxpayer is employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 306. A bill providing that there shall be equal pay for equal work for women; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 307. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.," to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 308. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950 which relate to price and wage controls and the settlement of labor disputes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 309. A bill to amend the programs on the watersheds authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 310. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), so as to establish a presumption of service connection in all cases of active tuberculosis which develop a 10-percent degree of disability within 3 years after separation from the service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 311. A bill providing for an additional military academy in the (southern district of the) State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 312. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH (by request):

H. R. 313. A bill to facilitate standardization and uniformity of procedure relating to determination and priority of combat connection of disabilities, injuries, or diseases alleged to have been incurred in, or aggravated by combat service in a war, campaign, or expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 314. A bill to amend the rules pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America from a staff in a church or public auditorium; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 315. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 316. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, title IV of the National Housing Act, and the judicial code in order to define the limitations of Government control of savings and loan associations, to provide judicial and administrative remedies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 317. A bill directing the Secretary of Commerce to provide for larger allocations of sulfur to increase production of newsprint; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 318. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with reference to the building and construction in-

dustry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 319. A bill to place on the retired list certain commissioned officers of the Army who served during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 320. A bill to provide for the return to the State of California of certain original documents and maps, known as the Spanish-Mexican land-grant papers, deposited in the National Archives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 321. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide compensation for employers required to withhold income tax at source on the wages of employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 322. A bill to amend paragraph (A) (1) of Public Law No. 662, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 869, second session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 323. A bill to guarantee that the civil liberties of labor shall not be abridged; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 324. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption to certain handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 325. A bill to promote the development of minerals in lands under the jurisdiction of a department or agency of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 326. A bill to prohibit the establishment of a valley authority in any State that would be substantially affected thereby until the people of the affected areas of such State have voted affirmatively for such valley authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 327. A bill establishing a general policy with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property by providing for the taxation of certain Federal property and for payments in connection with certain other Federal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 328. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 329. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 330. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the American school teacher; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 331. A bill to incorporate National Service Star Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 332. A bill to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 333. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army in certain cases to undertake small river and harbor improvement projects not specifically authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 334. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 335. A bill to amend the mineral leasing laws in order to eliminate the waiver of rentals for oil and gas leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 336. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 337. A bill to authorize the issuance of 300,000 special nonquota immigration visas to certain refugees, persons of German ethnic origin, and natives of Italy, Greece, and the

Netherlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 338. A bill to provide out-patient treatment for non-service-connected disabilities for certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 339. A bill to extend for a period of 2 years the education and training benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 340. A bill to increase certain disability pension awards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 341. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to certain dependents of deceased veterans of World War I, World War II, and of service on or after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 342. A bill to extend pension benefits payable under the veterans regulations to persons who served with the United States military occupation forces in Germany during World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 343. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer and the additional exemption for his spouse from \$600 to \$1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from \$600 to \$750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 344. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to require that all decisions of the Supreme Court shall be participated in by the full Court, and that any vacancies or absences in the membership of the Court shall be temporarily filled by circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 345. A bill to amend part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 346. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces who suffer disability or death while performing travel to and from specified types of active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 347. A bill to amend section 13 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the exemption from the child-labor provisions of such act of certain employees employed in agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 348. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 349. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the sale at certain post offices of tobacco, cigar, and cigarette tax stamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 350. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey to determine the need for improvement of East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico to Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla., via Destin; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 351. A bill to authorize the dredging of a boat basin at Apalachicola, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 352. A bill to authorize the construction of a channel at East Point in Apalachicola Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 353. A bill to provide a channel across St. George Island from the Gulf of Mexico

into Apalachicola Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 354. A bill to provide for preliminary examination and survey to determine the need for a channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla., in the vicinity of Point Washington, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 355. A bill to provide for the construction and maintenance of a channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay via East Pass; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 356. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 357. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 358. A bill to provide that compensation of a Federal officer or employee shall be subject to State or municipal tax only in the State where he is domiciled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 359. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 360. A bill to amend section 1341 of title 28 of the United States Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 361. A bill to admit 50,000 immigrants, natives and citizens of Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 362. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 363. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 364. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 365. A bill to grant certain former officers of the Army who enlisted for aviation cadet training certain lump-sum payments of which they were deprived by the enactment of the Flight Officer Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 366. A bill to protect the right of individuals to be free from discrimination or segregation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 367. A bill to require a premarital examination of all applicants for marriage licenses in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 368. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the States and their political subdivisions for the loss of tax revenue with respect to certain real property, and improvements thereon, acquired by the United States and used by the Armed Forces for recreational and welfare purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 369. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 370. A bill to amend section 212 (d) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 371. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 372. A bill to provide for the display of the flag of the United States outside premises wherein deceased members or former members of the Armed Forces are lying in state, and at funerals of such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 373. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 374. A bill to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 375. A bill to improve the efficiency of the United States civil service; to deny benefits, under the civil-service and other retirement systems, to persons convicted of certain felonies; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 376. A bill to promote greater economy in the operations of the Federal Government by providing for a consolidated cash budget, a separation of operating from capital expenditures, long-range budget estimates, the scheduling of legislative action on appropriation measures, yea-and-nay votes on amendments to appropriation measures, and a Presidential item veto; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 377. A bill to provide for national flood insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 378. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Boston, Mass., as the Dr. Harvey Cushing Veterans' Administration Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 379. A bill granting a limited exemption from income tax in the case of pensions and annuities received by widows and orphans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 380. A bill to correct the naval record of former members of the crews of the revenue cutters *Algonquin* and *Onondaga*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURLINSON:

H. R. 381. A bill to confirm and establish in the State of Texas the title to certain submerged coastal lands of such State and to the natural resources within such lands and the waters above such lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 382. A bill to permit certain students to receive Reserve Officers Training Corps military training at institutions other than the ones they are attending; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 383. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for totally disabled individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 384. A bill to provide for standards to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture governing imported agricultural food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 439. A bill to amend section 13 (c) of Public Law 393 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 440. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 441. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 442. A bill to establish and maintain a domestic gold coin standard; to restore the right of American citizens to own gold and gold coins; to return control over the public purse to the people; to restrain further deterioration of our currency; to enable holders of paper money to redeem it in gold coin on demand; to open up foreign trade through the channels of private enterprise; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. R. 443. A bill to grant certain interests in mineral rights, including oil and gas rights, to persons who have acquired or hereafter acquire land pursuant to homestead entry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 444. A bill to amend the act of May 19, 1947, so as to increase the percentage of certain trust funds held by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation which is to be distributed per capita to individual members of such tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 445. A bill to authorize the appointment of two additional circuit judges for the ninth circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 446. A bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 447. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 448. A bill to authorize in certain cases the appointment of special counsel and investigators to assist grand juries in the exercise of their powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 449. A bill to amend section 3 (a) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 450. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Displaced Persons Commission and the War Claims Commission to the Department of State in accordance with a recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 451. A bill making certain changes in laws applicable to regulatory agencies of the Government so as to effectuate the recommendations regarding regulatory agencies made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 452. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 453. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 454. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of selective immigrants possessing skills beneficial to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 455. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Council Bluffs, Iowa, a post-office and courthouse building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 456. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide full annuity for individuals who have completed 30 years of service; to provide annuities thereunder equal to 50 percent of the average monthly salaries or wages based on the 5 years of highest earnings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 457. A bill to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American service man or woman who lost his or her life while serving in one of the various theaters of war during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 458. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the criminal penalty provided for persons convicted of gathering or delivering certain defense information to aid a foreign government in time of peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 459. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 460. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to the four heroic chaplains who sacrificed their lives in the sinking of the steamship *Dorchester*; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 461. A bill to provide increases in the rates of death compensation payable to certain widows and children of veterans of World War I, World War II, or of service on and after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 462. A bill to provide vocational rehabilitation for certain service-connected disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 463. A bill to prohibit the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 464. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Theater and Opera House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 465. A bill to establish a Board of Education in the Federal Government and to define its organization, powers, and duties; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 466. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real properties owned by the United States of America or its agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 467. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the anti-trust laws, establishing a uniform statute

of limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 468. A bill to punish the malicious destruction of aircraft and attempts to destroy aircraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 469. A bill to reestablish the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 470. A bill to provide books and sound-reproduction records for certain physically incapacitated persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 471. A bill to pay certain substitute postal employees time and one-half overtime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 472. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so that the taxes imposed under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system will not be imposed on account of service performed by individuals who have attained the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 473. A bill to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to provide entitlement to educational benefits for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted prior to October 6, 1945, on a same basis as for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted within 1 year after October 6, 1945; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 474. A bill to provide for additional tax deductions from the gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 475. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 476. A bill to permit Civil War veterans to receive hospital treatment in hospitals of their choice if Veterans' Administration facilities are not available in their locality; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 477. A bill to authorize acquisition and interception of communications in interest of national security and defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 478. A bill to authorize in certain cases the appointment of special counsel and investigators to assist grand juries in the exercise of their powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 479. A bill to preserve seniority rights of 10-point preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 480. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to authorize the extension of old-age and survivors insurance benefits under the act to State and local employees who are covered by State or local retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 481. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure), so as to prohibit the payment of awards of annuity in the case of Government officers and employees convicted of a felony, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 482. A bill to provide for the credit of subscription charges or insurance premiums with respect to health or medical service plans or programs, or health or medical insurance for the purposes of the Federal income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

or segregation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 580. A bill to enable the mothers and widows of deceased members of the Armed Forces now interred in cemeteries outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska to make a pilgrimage to such cemeteries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 581. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt payments under such act from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 582. A bill to provide for the acquisition, restoration, and maintenance of the burial ground of 256 Maryland heroes of the American Revolution and erection of a suitable memorial; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 583. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 584. A bill to create the Board of Postal Rates and Fees in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 585. A bill to provide a cost-of-living pay increase for officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 586. A bill to amend section 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 587. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 588. A bill providing an allowance for the purchase of uniforms for city and village delivery letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 589. A bill to provide for a preliminary survey of the mouth of the Sparkill Creek and the immediate area of the Hudson River thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 590. A bill to provide compensatory time for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays by clerks in third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 591. A bill to amend the act of May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 223), as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 592. A bill to restore directory service for letters and parcels sent through the mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 593. A bill to authorize the renewal at increased rates of existing contracts for mail-messenger service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 594. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years, to provide that such annuity for any month shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 595. A bill to provide that Fort Montgomery, N. Y., may tap the West Point water-supply line, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 596. A bill to provide that the compensation the United States shall pay the

Borough of Blairsville, Pa., for certain land and improvements thereon, shall include the replacement costs of such improvements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 597. A bill to conform provisions relating to payments in lieu of taxes in Lanham Act (act of October 14, 1940, as amended) to provisions in Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 598. A bill granting an exemption from income tax in the case of certain pensions and annuities of policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 599. A bill relating to the income-tax liability of members of the Armed Forces dying in the service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 600. A bill to authorize additional funds for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 601. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1948, so as to provide that disability and death benefits based on military service may be excluded from net income in establishing rents for certain low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 602. A bill to provide double pay for certain infantrymen in combat, and to credit such infantrymen with double time for days spent in combat; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 603. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from \$600 to \$700; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 604. A bill to amend section 117 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to iron-ore royalties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 605. A bill allowing a credit against the additional estate tax for inheritance, estate, legacy, or succession taxes paid to any State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 606. A bill to encourage the prevention of water pollution by allowing amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 607. A bill to amend section 8 of the act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code (Public Law 378, 81st Cong.) to permit persons under a disability to take advantage of same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 608. A bill to amend section 811 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to limit its application in certain disability cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 609. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the time for filing individual income-tax returns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 610. A bill to provide for the correction of inequities under the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 611. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the tax treatment of income derived by domestic corporations from sources within foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 612. A bill to allow taxpayers, in computing adjusted gross income, to deduct expenses paid or incurred by them in connection with their employment on a com-

mission basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 613. A bill to repeal the Buy American Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 614. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 615. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide additional requirements for State plans for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 616. A bill to extend the rights, benefits, and privileges granted to World War II veterans to certain citizens of the United States who entered the armed forces of governments allied with the United States during World War II, and to their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 617. A bill to provide for the payment of increased special pensions to persons holding the Congressional Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 618. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 619. A bill to authorize certain additional appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 620. A bill to require that a more adequate statement of the ingredients in certain insecticides and other economic poisons be contained on the labels thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 621. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 with reference to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 622. A bill to provide for the operation of a convalescent and rehabilitation hospital at the Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility, Clinton, Iowa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 623. A bill making the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as Constitution Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 624. A bill to exempt certain non-profit religious and charitable organizations from the tax imposed on billiard and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 625. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 626. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 627. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Trudeau Sanatorium, Saranac Lake, N. Y.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 628. A bill to prohibit the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 629. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries

and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 630. A bill to provide vocational rehabilitation for certain service-connected disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 631. A bill to provide that compensation of veterans for service-connected disability rated 20 percent or less disabling shall be paid quarterly rather than monthly; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 632. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 633. A bill to establish a Federal Board of Hospitalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 634. A bill to extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 635. A bill to clarify the right of sellers to engage in competition by in good faith meeting the equally low price of a competitor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 636. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 637. A bill to extend the watershed programs authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 638. A bill to repeal certain restrictions on cotton acreage reports; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 639. A bill to repeal provisions of law exempting labor organizations from the anti-trust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 640. A bill to make it unlawful for any officer in the executive branch of the Government to take or maintain possession and control of any private property except pursuant to statutory authority for such action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 641. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 642. A bill to require that cases in which the Supreme Court has original jurisdiction be decided by the affirmative vote of at least five members of the Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 643. A bill to provide for promotion by merit of employees in the postal service and to establish uniform procedures for

examination and appointment of candidates for promotion to supervisory positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 644. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 645. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the \$75 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 646. A bill to prescribe the minimum number of personnel of the Army to be assigned as instructors of Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 647. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. J. Res. 4. Joint Resolution authorizing a compact or agreement between the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and certain other States, and the Dominion of Canada, with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to redefine treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution providing for the appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase from France by President Thomas Jefferson in 1803 and for public celebrations, historical exhibits, and pageants in the 17 Louisiana Purchase States in 1953 and 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution providing the power of subpoena and to grant immunity in certain investigations relating to improper and illegal conduct in the transaction of the business of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to service in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution declaring the 14th day of June in each year to be a legal holiday, and requesting the President to issue a special proclamation commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution providing for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the power of Congress to impose income taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize Congress; in admitting any new State, to limit its representation in the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for filling the office of President after a vote of no confidence by the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college system and to provide for the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution requiring congressional authorization for sending military forces abroad; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution prohibiting the use of Federal funds to pay the salaries and expenses of Federal officers and employees performing functions in connection with the unauthorized seizure of steel mills or other private property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution safeguarding the economic stability of the United States by imposing limitations on expenditures during the fiscal year 1954; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war or grave national

emergency declared by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution limiting the spending powers of the Congress and to provide for reduction of the national debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution designating the first Tuesday of March of each year as National Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to fix the number of Justices of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a committee to designate the most appropriate day for National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a stamp commemorative of Dr. William Crawford Gorgas, of Alabama, who achieved national distinction in the field of preventive medicine by conquering yellow fever, thus making possible the building of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that a provision of a treaty which conflicts with any provision of this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval and reduction of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE (by request):

H. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution designating the fourth Saturday of August of each year as Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution declaring that the Yalta agreement is no longer binding on the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution acknowledging, confirming, and establishing the title of the States to the navigable waters and lands beneath such navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "Interfaith Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution designating November 19 the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to redefine treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, 1953, as a day for Nation-wide prayer for peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of a permanent memorial to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to removal of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution amending the joint resolution entitled, "Joint resolution to provide for the adjudication by a commissioner of claims of American nationals against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," approved August 4, 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution amending sections 1606 and 1607 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution granting free postage to members of the Armed Forces, while confined for treatment in a military or naval hospital, and to veterans while being furnished hospital treatment or institutional care in institutions operated by or under contract with the Veterans Admin-

istration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution providing for the American Joint Commission To Assist in the Unification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1953, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution appointing a board of engineers to examine and report upon the proposed central Arizona project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution amending the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, relating to the display and use of the flag, so as to establish a rule that no foreign national or supranational flag shall be publicly displayed unless it is accompanied by the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the effect of treaties and international agreements upon the civil and property rights of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday of June of each year as National Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution providing for a study and investigation of the grade classification and salary scale of certain employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the taxing and spending powers of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution providing for the appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the

capital offenses at all times; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1029. A bill to provide for the deduction and credit of contributions or subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1030. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to States, municipalities, and other political subdivisions of States for the construction of devices for protection of property from storms, floods, or erosion; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1031. A bill authorizing the prosecution of the work of improvement for purposes of beach erosion control at Atlantic City, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1032. A bill to establish a National Superhighway Commission to provide for plans and surveys for the construction of a national superhighway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1033. A bill to amend the rules pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America by requiring the display of the flag of the United States of America whenever any other flag or pennant is displayed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1034. A bill to terminate the war-tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1035. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 1036. A bill to provide that local boards of the Selective Service System shall make available for publication certain information about persons inducted, deferred, or exempted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1037. A bill to establish the Green River Canyons National Park, in the States of Colorado and Utah, from a portion of the Dinosaur National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1038. A bill to prohibit the construction, operation, or maintenance of any project for the storage or delivery of water within or affecting any national park or monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1039. A bill to provide for the installation and utilization of electrical equipment in the House of Representatives for recording and counting votes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1040. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, so as to require that motor vehicles operated for pleasure purposes in the District of Columbia by minors, licensed to drive in the District of Columbia shall carry emblems or devices calling attention to the fact that such motor vehicles are being operated by minors; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1041. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide a direct Federal pension of at least \$100 per month to all American citizens who have been citizens 10 years or over, to be prorated according to the cost of living as on January 3, 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 1042. A bill to provide biweekly pay periods for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1043. A bill to restore to civilian officers and employees of the United States and of the government of the District of Columbia the right to accumulate annual

leave; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1044. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for widows of certain former Federal employees who had rendered 25 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1045. A bill to protect the civil-service retirement rights of hospitalized veterans in service-connected cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1046. A bill relating to the rate of postage on certain publications entered as second-class matter prior to June 28, 1932; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 1047. A bill to provide pension for certain widows of recipients of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 1048. A bill to create the Inter-oceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1049. A bill to provide for the national defense through the acquisition of domestically produced manganese ores and concentrates essential to the manufacture of supplies and material for the Armed Forces in time of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 1050. A bill to amend section 459 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1051. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 1052. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit persons engaged in national defense activities to occupy dwellings in housing projects developed under that act in critical defense housing areas without regard to the income limitations contained in that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 1053. A bill to erect a suitable shrine on the U. S. S. *Arizona* at Pearl Harbor in memory of the crew killed in the Japanese attack on December 7, 1941; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1054. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Papago Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1055. A bill to terminate Federal discriminations against the Indians of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1056. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Davis-Monthan Field, Tucson, Ariz.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1057. A bill to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 1058. A bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 1059. A bill to increase the personal-income-tax exemption of a taxpayer from \$600 to \$800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1060. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public, elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1061. A bill to establish the name of Kiser Glacier on Mount Baker, Wash.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1062. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1063. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of California with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1064. A bill to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1065. A bill to recognize naval service performed in sweeping the North Sea of mines in 1919 as service in World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 1066. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 1067. A bill to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make and publish rules for procedure on review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1068. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1069. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, regarding published articles and broadcasts by foreign agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1070. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 1071. A bill to consolidate and revise the laws governing mutual defense assistance and related foreign-aid programs, and to authorize appropriations for such programs for the fiscal year 1954; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 1072. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to athletic and certain other events, where the proceeds inure exclusively to the benefit of a community chest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1073. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the acts of September 23, 1950, and September 30, 1950, providing financial assistance to local educational agencies, so as to remove discrimination against larger school districts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1074. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1075. A bill to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to certain volunteer firemen injured while performing duty as firemen on property under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1076. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Federal Government by providing for the improvement of the training of Federal civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1077. A bill to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for

S. 66. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Pedraza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 67. A bill for the relief of Anastasia John Tsamisis;

S. 68. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Godschalk; and

S. 69. A bill for the relief of Dr. Peter C. T. Kao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 70. A bill to amend section 4 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to extend to certain medical personnel credit for military service rendered in the armed forces of cobelligent nations during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 71. A bill for the relief of Bernard W. Olson; and

S. 72. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Angelopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 73. A bill providing for the payment by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs of medical and hospital expenses incurred by Daniel E. Robertson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 74. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interest in such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 75. A bill to prohibit certain reservations of mineral interests by Federal land banks, the Land Bank Commissioner, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Association, and to provide for disposition of certain mineral interests heretofore reserved by them; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Young when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 76. A bill to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and to require the divestment of nonbanking assets; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 77. A bill to prohibit hunting, trapping, and fishing on public lands in violation of State or Territorial laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 78. A bill to provide for removal from, and the prevention of appointment to, offices or positions in the executive branch of the Government of persons who are found to be security risks or disloyal to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 79. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Kentucky to acquire non-Federal cave properties within the authorized boundaries of Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 80. A bill for the relief of Roy Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 81. A bill to require certain members of the legislative and executive branches of the Government to file additional copies of their annual Federal income-tax return; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 82. A bill to permit exploration, location, entry, and disposition under the mineral-land laws of the United States of certain lands acquired by the United States; and

S. 83. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 84. A bill for the relief of Joseph Amin Kehdi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 85. A bill to prevent Federal dam and reservoir projects from interfering with sustained-yield timber operations;

S. 86. A bill to authorize payment, on a fair and equitable basis, to the States and their political subdivisions for the replace-

ment, relocation, rebuilding, or improvement of public highway facilities inundated, abandoned, damaged, or destroyed by the construction or operation of certain public works of the United States; and

S. 87. A bill authorizing the modification of the general plan for the comprehensive development of the Columbia River Basin to provide for additional hydroelectric power development; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 88. A bill to provide for the addition to the Willamette National Cemetery of the Veterans Burial Plot of Lincoln Memorial Park, Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; and

S. 89. A bill to authorize the presentation of claims of the Coos (or Kowes) Bay, Lower Umpqua (or Kalawatset), and Siuslaw Tribes of Indians to the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 90. A bill to authorize the payment by the Veterans' Administration of increased compensation on account of service-connected total deafness to veterans in receipt of compensation; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 91. A bill to require the identification of cotton products for the protection and benefit of the producers and consumers thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 92. A bill for the relief of Thomas Post; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 93. A bill to authorize grants to enable the States to survey, coordinate, supplement, and strengthen their existing health resources so that hospital and medical care may be obtained by all persons; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 94. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 95. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Donka Kourteva Dikova (Dikoff) and her son Nicola Marin Dikoff;

S. 96. A bill for the relief of Kuniko Vicent;

S. 97. A bill for the relief of Gunhard Oravas and Virve Oravas;

S. 98. A bill for the relief of (Mrs.) Betty Thornton or Jozsefne Toth;

S. 99. A bill to provide for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from lynching, and for other purposes;

S. 100. A bill for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.;

S. 101. A bill for the relief of Phed Vosniacos;

S. 102. A bill for the relief of Francesco Cracchiolo; and

S. 103. A bill for the relief of Silverio Salvatore Conte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 104. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Food and Drug district office at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 105. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 106. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ferguson when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 107. A bill to provide for the development of the oil and gas reserves of the Conti-

mental Shelf adjacent to the shores of the United States, to protect certain equities therein, to confirm the titles of the several States to lands underlying inland navigable waters within State boundaries, and for other purposes; and

S. 108. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on certain claims of individual Navajo Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 109. A bill for the relief of Crisanto Castillo Underwood;

S. 110. A bill for the relief of Christopher F. Jako;

S. 111. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida McCabe; and

S. 112. A bill to amend section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 so as to establish a minimum payment of compensation for the survivors of prisoners of war who died during imprisonment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 113. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school authorities of Valencia County, N. Mex., in the construction and improvement of public-school facilities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 114. A bill authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 115. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 116. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton reclamation project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 117. A bill to amend section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1941 relating to the apportionment of moneys received on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 118. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the initial phase of the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma; and

S. 119. A bill to provide for the construction of the Markham Ferry project on the Grand River in Oklahoma by the Grand River Dam Authority, an instrumentality of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 120. A bill for the relief of Gerasimos Giannatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. 121. A bill authorizing the construction of a highway bridge across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal at Summit, Del.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Frear when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 122. A bill directing the conveyance of certain property to the city of Rupert, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 123. A bill for the relief of Anni Wilhelmne Skoda;

S. 124. A bill for the relief of Wolf-Rudiger Johannes Urban;

S. 125. A bill for the relief of Arthur Oppenheimer, Jr., and Mrs. Jane Oppenheimer;

We did not go to Ottawa, by right, as members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. We went by invitation, as guests, and we were present for only 2 days of discussions which lasted a full week. On those 2 days, the subject was International Affairs and Defense.

The delegates who were assembled there from all over the world—representing 48 parliaments of the British Commonwealth—were an exceptionally able group of men and women. They included members not only from the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, but also from India and Pakistan, and from Malaya, the Gold Coast, Jamaica, and others, as well.

It was as diverse a group as one could imagine, Mr. President, with different backgrounds and different problems, but held together by a common interest in the success of representative government. The discussions were frank and vigorous; and there were, of course, differing viewpoints which were presented forcefully and honestly.

The whole experience was intensely interesting and stimulating, and I think I gained an insight into some of the problems of the world which I did not have previously, and which will be extremely helpful to me in discharging my duties as a Senator.

I commend the meetings of this and like associations to all other Members of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 251. A bill to amend section 1923 (a) of title 28, United States Code, relating to docket fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARRAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 252. A bill to permit all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected to be brought in the district courts with right of trial by jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 253. A bill for the relief of O/Y Concrete A/B;

S. 254. A bill for the relief of Kristine Lea Kimball;

S. 255. A bill for the relief of Sister Odilla, also known as Maria Hutter;

S. 256. A bill for the relief of Dr. Klaus C. Karde and Ingeborg Karde;

S. 257. A bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan;

S. 258. A bill for the relief of Bogdan Wastel;

S. 259. A bill for the relief of Marina Bernardis Zivolich and Mirko Zivolich; and

S. 260. A bill for the relief of Ahmet Hal-dun Koca Taskin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 261. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut

River flood-control compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 262. A bill to authorize a program for runoff and water flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention for the Green River watershed in Kentucky and Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 263. A bill to amend title III of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to provide price support for 1953 and 1954 crops of oats, rye, and barley at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 264. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the State of Maryland to the Disney-Bell Post, No. 68, of the American Legion, Bowie, Md.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 265. A bill to adjust the status of an alien who is in the United States and who is a quota immigrant;

S. 266. A bill to adjust the status of an alien who is in the United States and who is a quota immigrant;

S. 267. A bill for the relief of Pantells Morfessis;

S. 268. A bill for the relief of Harold Trevor Colbourn;

S. 269. A bill for the relief of Dr. Richard Raoul Rigler; and

S. 270. A bill for the relief of the city of Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 271. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late George Herman (Babe) Ruth; and

S. 272. A bill to pay an annuity to Richard W. Goodhart; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 273. A bill to provide compensation to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of Indians for certain lands on the Riverton reclamation project within the ceded portion of the Wind River or Shoshone Indian Reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 274. A bill to require the keeping of more detailed records and the furnishing of additional information by certain persons for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUNT when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 275. A bill to further define the national transportation policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUNT when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 276. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to prohibit the deduction of expenses or losses incurred in illegal wagering; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUNT when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 277. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing more equitable schedules of salaries for teachers in the public elementary and secondary schools, and to promote the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 278. A bill for the relief of Szyga (Saul) Morgenstern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. CLEMENTS):

S. 279. A bill to authorize the construction of certain public works for navigation and flood control on the Big Sandy River and the Tug and Levisa Forks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 280. A bill to provide price support for the 1952 crop of Maryland tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TOBEY (by request):

S. 281. A bill to amend section 1 (17) (a), section 13 (3), and section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against or to constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOBEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 282. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Hiller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 283. A bill to provide a transcontinental superhighway with alternate sections; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 284. A bill for the relief of Darío Del Basso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 285. A bill to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 286. A bill to amend section 402 (a) of the National Housing Act to change the name of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 287. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Jake Alexander a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 288. A bill for the relief of Miho Koshiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 289. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to provide further relief for persons in military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 290. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to improve credit services available to farmers seeking to change or diversify their farming operations or adjust and improve their farming practices; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 291. A bill to amend the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 292. A bill for the relief of James Greenwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 293. A bill to extend the period within which courses of instruction may be initiated pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by certain veterans unable to avail themselves of such educational benefits because of illness or physical disability; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DANIEL:

S. 294. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within original State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for jurisdiction, use, and control of

the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf lying outside of the original State boundaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. DANIEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 295. A bill for the creation of a Commission on Congressional Salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 296. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Henry Litmanowitz (Litman); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 297. A bill for the relief of Dr. Arthur Tye; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 298. A bill to afford the taxpayer the right to determine the period of useful life of property in computing deductions for depreciation under the income-tax laws; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. FREAR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 299. A bill to reduce certain rates of postage on parcels sent to or by members of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed outside the United States;

S. 300. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States, serving outside continental United States or in Alaska; and

S. 301. A bill to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 302. A bill for the relief of Emery and Eleanor Nussbaum;

S. 303. A bill for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr;

S. 304. A bill for the relief of Harry H. Winternitz and Jenta Winternitz;

S. 305. A bill for the relief of Antonio Vocale;

S. 306. A bill for the relief of Waltraut Mies van der Rohe;

S. 307. A bill for the relief of Amy Beverley Wong;

S. 308. A bill for the relief of Filolao Tsolakis and his wife, Vassiliki Tsolakis;

S. 309. A bill for the relief of Betty Kiyoko Salto;

S. 310. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Romano;

S. 311. A bill for the relief of Francesco Palumbo;

S. 312. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Orsi;

S. 313. A bill for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama;

S. 314. A bill for the relief of Cornelius A. Navori;

S. 315. A bill for the relief of Owen Lowery;

S. 316. A bill for the relief of Vera Lazaros and Cristo Lazaros;

S. 317. A bill for the relief of Hans Horn;

S. 318. A bill for the relief of Guenter Hoffman;

S. 319. A bill for the relief of Carlo di Luigi e di Beltrami Adalgisa Gola;

S. 320. A bill for the relief of Robert David Franklin (Shunichi Tanimura);

S. 321. A bill for the relief of John Aristidis Dragazis;

S. 322. A bill for the relief of Anna Alello;

S. 323. A bill for the relief of Rose Cohen; and

S. 324. A bill for the relief of Gregory Leon Baranowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (by request):

S. 325. A bill for the relief of Patricia Ann Cary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPPEL:

S. 326. A bill for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec;

S. 327. A bill for the relief of Tarik S. Kaynor; and

S. 328. A bill for the relief of Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, Martha Aguilera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 329. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250), and to rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska;

S. 330. A bill to provide for segregation of the interests of individual members of the various Indian tribes in funds deposited in the Treasury to the credit of such tribes;

S. 331. A bill to provide for disposition of inherited interests in the estates of deceased Indian allottees;

S. 332. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations; and

S. 333. A bill to repeal the act of August 9, 1946, providing for the preparation of a membership roll of the Indians of the Yakima Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 334. A bill to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 335. A bill to provide a decree of competency for United States Indians in certain cases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 336. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 30 years' service;

S. 337. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to permit the retirement of postal employees who have rendered at least 30 years of service;

S. 338. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to permit redeposit by reemployed annuitants of refunds of contributions and to allow credit for service covered by such deposits;

S. 339. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt from taxation annuities of retired employees;

S. 340. A bill to provide maternity leave for Government employees;

S. 341. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired prior to April 1, 1948;

S. 342. A bill to adjust the rates of annuities for certain employees retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, prior to April 1, 1948; and

S. 343. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for the widows of employees who died prior to February 28, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 344. A bill for the relief of Anna Josephine Vigo;

S. 345. A bill for the relief of Samuel Chalut;

S. 346. A bill for the relief of Alick Bhark;

S. 347. A bill for the relief of George Tarpale;

S. 348. A bill for the relief of Antonios Lygizos;

S. 349. A bill for the relief of May Ling Ng;

S. 350. A bill for the relief of John Mroczek; and

S. 351. A bill for the relief of Catherine Nina Cole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial to Dr. J. Finley Wilson, in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and Mr. PAYNE):

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. SMATHERS,

Mr. BYRD, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CORDON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. SCHOEPPPEL, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DUFF, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. THYE, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. MCCARRAN):

S. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HOLLAND when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution to provide for the transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation of functions relating to irrigation projects on Indian reservations; and

S. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution to reopen certain lands in the State of Washington to entry under the mining laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PRICE SUPPORT FOR OATS, RYE, AND BARLEY AT 90 PERCENT OF PARITY DURING 1953 AND 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend title III of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. The bill proposes to place oats, barley, and rye crops in the same category as the six basic crops, namely, under the 90 percent of parity price support for 1953 and 1954.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 263) to amend title III of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to provide price support for 1953 and 1954 crops of oats, rye, and barley at 90 percent of parity, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 1425. A bill to provide study periods for post-office clerks and terminal transfer air-mail field clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1426. A bill to further amend the provisions of the acts authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of persons in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1427. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to strengthen American agriculture and reduce the cost of price-support operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 1428. A bill to authorize the National Park Service to rebuild Jackson's Ramparts and to designate particular sites with proper markers and to appropriate funds for this purpose; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 1429. A bill making an appropriation for the construction of a post-office terminal in Denver, Colo., on the site which has been acquired by the United States for that purpose; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 1430. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1431. A bill to amend section 113 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMALL:

H. R. 1432. A bill to provide price support for the 1952 crop of Maryland tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1433. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1434. A bill to amend the act of February 24, 1925, incorporating the American War Mothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1435. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1436. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1437. A bill relating to the annual adjustment of the basic pay of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1438. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish space and facilities, if available, to full-time representatives of certain recognized State organizations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1439. A bill to provide for advancement to the commissioned and warrant officer grades for enlisted musicians of the

United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1440. A bill to provide relief for certain officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1441. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to wrestling matches held as competitions between high schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 1442. A bill to authorize a program for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention for the Green River watershed in Kentucky and Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WAMLER:

H. R. 1443. A bill providing an allowance for the purchase of uniforms for city and village delivery letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 1444. A bill to provide an adequate channel in Old and Atchafalaya Rivers; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution designating March 30 of each year as Shut-in's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution empowering Congress to provide for national representation for the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall withhold from representatives of foreign nations privileges which such nations withhold from representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution declaring that the Yalta agreement is no longer binding on the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCINTIRE:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the International Joint Commission on the United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power proj-

ect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the International Joint Commission on the United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the International Joint Commission on the United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution providing for continuation of the suspension of certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution permitting articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State-Far East Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May in each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution making January 19 and 20, 1953, holidays for Federal employees, field service postal employees, and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the meetings of the United Nations Assembly, and similar world organizations of which the United States is a member, should be opened with prayer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution requesting the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Navy to observe the provisions, and intent of the act of Congress section 208 (d) Department of Justice Appropriation Act of 1953, and suspend the further prosecuting of the action pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, entitled "United States of America against Fallbrook Public Utility District and others"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 61. Resolution requesting the President to forward the evidence and findings of the Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre to the United States Mission to the United Nations for appropriate action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. Res. 62. Resolution requesting the President to forward the evidence and findings of the Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre to the United States Mission to the United Nations for appropriate action, and

scope and composition of the agencies, and of providing opportunity for the committee again to be brought up to date on what these agencies are doing.

This review of each agency will encompass: (a) its jurisdiction; (b) its organization; (c) its administrative policies; and (d) such changes, additions, or modifications in these which their administrative experience may suggest.

Thirdly, the various persons and industries affected by such legislation and subject to the administrative procedures of these agencies will be invited to discuss with us their opinions as to the effectiveness of the administration and to suggest any changes which their experience during the years indicate now may be desirable in the public interest.

In connection with this review with the agencies and with affected persons, I am concerned primarily with fundamental issues and policies and not with small or inconsequential procedural details, unless such have an over-all adverse effect on the work of the agency.

A number of years have passed since most of the legislation was enacted and the agencies established. It seems most appropriate, therefore, now to review them in the light of the accumulated experience of these years, to reexamine the basic purposes underlying the statutes, the reasons prompting the original enactment, their continuing application and desirability, the changes which time may have shown appropriately should be made or new legislation required, all from the viewpoint of most fully and effectively meeting the public interest.

Some of the subject matters under the committee's jurisdiction which will be taken up under the program I have described are:

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES ADMINISTERING LAWS RESULTING FROM BILLS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THIS COMMITTEE

First. Department of Commerce:

- (a) Bureau of Standards.
- (b) Civil Aeronautics Administration.
- (c) Weather Bureau.
- (d) Inland Waterways Corporation.

Second. Department of the Interior:

- (a) Oil and Gas Division.
- (b) Oil interstate compacts.

Third. Federal Communications Commission.

Fourth. Federal Power Commission.

Fifth. Federal Security Agency:

- (a) Public Health Service.
- (b) Food and Drug Administration.
- (c) Social Security Board—in connection with Railroad Retirement funds.

Sixth. Federal Trade Commission.

Seventh. Interstate Commerce Commission:

- (a) Railroads generally.
- (b) Motor carriers.
- (c) Freight forwarders.
- (d) Certain inland water carriers.
- (e) Standard time regulations.
- (f) Petroleum pipelines.

Eighth. Railroad Retirement Board.

Ninth. National Mediation Board—re railroad labor.

Tenth. Petroleum.

Eleventh. National Science Foundation.

Twelfth. Civil Aeronautics Board.

Thirteenth. War Claims Commission.

Fourteenth. Department of Justice: Office of Alien Property.

Fifteenth. Securities and Exchange Commission.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAWSON of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

VIRGINIA APPLE CIDER VINEGAR

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the last session, the Congress enacted an amendment to the Defense Production Act providing that no price ceiling should be placed on any fruit or vegetable in fresh or processed form.

I hold in my hand a ruling of OPS that vinegar made from Virginia apples is not fruit in processed form. I do not want to elaborate on the opinion, but it states that the vinegar is an alcoholic beverage. Now, Mr. Speaker, I notice that our Republican friends have received a great deal of publicity lately relative to the sale of alcoholic beverages in the new and fancy clubhouse of theirs here on the Hill, and I rise to suggest that they will get along better if they drink Virginia vinegar instead of any other form of alcoholic beverage. Some of my friends amongst the Republican leadership, judging from the expressions on some of their faces, must have been drinking vinegar as a beverage for a long time. But I recommend to them that in that new and fancy clubhouse, when the waiter asks: "What'll you have?", they say: "Make mine Virginia vinegar, the finest cocktail ever served, according to the OPS."

TIDELANDS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I arise to voice my most emphatic objection to the action of the President in attempting again fraudulently to deprive the people of Texas of their rights and true title to the so-called tidelands. This, unfortunately, is simply another attempt on the part of the Socialists in the administration to find some way whereby they can perpetuate the injustice which the American people clearly voted in the last election to correct. They are now attempting by this illegal method to do that which they cannot get the Congress to do, and they strike me as a bunch of thieves who have been caught in the act and are now trying to find a legal hole in which they can hide the swag.

THE PRESIDENT'S FAREWELL ADDRESS TO THE NATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point the text of President Truman's television and radio address of Thursday, January 15, 1953.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

I am happy to have this opportunity to talk to you once more before I leave the White House.

Next Tuesday, General Eisenhower will be inaugurated as President of the United States. A short time after the new President takes his oath of office, I will once again be a plain, private citizen of this Republic.

That is as it should be. Inauguration Day will be a great demonstration of our democratic process. I am glad to be a part of it—glad to wish General Eisenhower all possible success, as he begins his term—glad the whole world will have a chance to see how simply and how peacefully our American system transfers the vast power of the Presidency from my hands to his. It is a good object lesson in democracy. I am proud of it. I know you are, too.

During the last 2 months, I have done my best to make this transfer an orderly one. I have talked with my successor on the affairs of the country, both foreign and domestic, and my Cabinet officers have talked with their successors. I want to say that General Eisenhower and his associates have cooperated fully in this effort. Such an orderly transfer from one party to another has never taken place before in our history. I think a real precedent has been set.

In speaking to you tonight, I have no new revelations to make—no political statements—no policy announcements. There are simply a few things in my heart I want to say to you. I want to say good-by and thanks for your help. And I want to talk with you a little about what has happened since I became your President.

I am speaking to you from the room where I have worked since April 1945. This is the President's office in the west wing of the White House. And this is the desk where I have signed most of the papers that embodied the decisions I have made as President. It has been the desk for many Presidents, and will be the desk of many more.

Since I became President, I have been to Europe, Mexico, Canada, Brazil, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—Wake Island and Hawaii. I have visited almost every State in the Union. I have traveled 135,000 miles by air, 77,000 by rail, and 17,000 by ship. But the mail always followed me, and wherever I happened to be, that's where the office of the President was.

"CAN'T PASS THE BUCK"

The greatest part of the President's job is to make decisions—big ones and small ones, dozens of them almost every day. The papers may circulate around the Government for a while but they finally reach this desk. And then there's no place else for them to go. The President—whoever he is—has to decide. He can't pass the buck to anybody. No one else can do the deciding for him. That's his job.

That's what I've been doing here in this room, for almost eight years now. And over in the main part of the White House, there's a study on the second floor—a room much like this one—where I have worked at night and early in the morning on the papers I couldn't get to at the office.

Of course, for more than three years, Mrs. Truman and I were not living in the White House. We were across the street in the Blair House. That was when the White House almost fell down on us and had to be

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2707. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 2708. A bill to extend the Federal life insurance and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2709. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the work of individuals shall not apply to work performed by individuals who have attained the age of 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2710. A bill to repeal the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2711. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by increasing the statute of limitations in the case of certain crimes involving disloyalty to the United States to 15 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 2712. A bill to prevent military personnel from replacing civilians in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2713. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 2714. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide the maximum retirement pay for certain retired enlisted men for the period from July 1, 1942, through June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2715. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2716. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a fidelity trust fund in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2717. A bill to amend part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), so as to extend the period during which vocational rehabilitation training may be afforded certain hospitalized or otherwise incapacitated veterans and certain medical and dental students; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 2718. A bill to create the United States Medical and Dental Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 2719. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2720. A bill to amend chapter 1, subchapter C, of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2721. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 2722. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

gible waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 2723. A bill to provide a plan for greater opportunities of employment, for distribution to owners, management, and to all other employees certain amounts of corporate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2724. A bill to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 2725. A bill providing for the sale of certain lands in the Kisatchie National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2726. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2727. A bill to provide for price support at 100 percent of parity for the 1953 and 1954 crops of each basic agricultural commodity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 2728. A bill to designate the lake to be formed by the McNary lock and dam in the Columbia River, Wash. and Oreg., Lake Wallula; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 2729. A bill to amend section 1701 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of concerts conducted under municipal auspices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas:

H. R. 2730. A bill to provide for the abandonment of the flood-control project for the construction of the Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Kansas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2731. A bill to direct the Attorney General to conduct a direct preference primary for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 2732. A bill for the addition of levee and channel improvements to aid flood control on the American River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2733. A bill to grant succession to the War Damage Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2734. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the interest on certain obligations issued by the States and their political subdivisions shall not be tax exempt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2735. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 so as to authorize longevity step increases for officers and employees in grades above grade 10 of the General Schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2736. A bill to allow a parent, under certain circumstances, to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for the care of children while the parent is working, and to allow an income-tax exemption for any child who is supported by the taxpayer and who is a member of his household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 2737. A bill to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or

their committees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2738. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1937, known as the Water Facilities Act, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, so as to extend the provisions of such act to other areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 2739. A bill to amend subsection 405 (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (relating to misbranded food); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2740. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 2741. A bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting blind dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2742. A bill to authorize and direct the Civil Aeronautics Board to study the need for smog control in the vicinity of airports in order to promote safety in air navigation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2743. A bill to amend chapter 1, subchapter C, of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 2744. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2745. A bill to assist in preventing defective construction of housing aided under Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2746. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to \$15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official station, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at a rate of not exceeding 7 cents per mile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2747. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to the day for taking action when the last day for taking such action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2748. A bill to provide certain benefits for persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning December 8, 1910, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2749. A bill to provide clerical allowances at certain post offices of the fourth class; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 2750. A bill for the relief of the City and County of Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2751. A bill to provide an educational grant to children of certain veterans who died of service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2752. A bill to authorize the issue of United States Government life insurance and national service life insurance under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2753. A bill to provide certain increases of disability and death compensation payable to veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2754. A bill to amend section 3 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2755. A bill to provide that post-office fixtures and equipment for use in first-, second-, and third-class post offices shall be furnished by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 2756. A bill to provide more equitably for the medical care of dependents of personnel of the Coast Guard under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 2757. A bill to amend section 1701 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of concerts conducted under municipal auspices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2758. A bill to amend section 1701 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to classical ballet performances conducted under certain auspices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMALL:

H. R. 2759. A bill to authorize the Public Utilities Commission to limit the taxicab licenses to be issued in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 2760. A bill to permit in certain cases children under 18 years of age who are to be adopted in the United States to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 2761. A bill to revive and reenact the act of December 21, 1944, authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 2762. A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1086, 1101; 16 U. S. C. 497); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2763. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to modify the duty on the importation of wood dowels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 2764. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to modify the duty on the importation of wood dowels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2765. A bill providing a direct Federal old-age pension at the rate of \$100 per month to certain citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2766. A bill to extend the benefits of the Combat Duty Pay Act of 1952 to certain members of the uniformed services who have served or shall serve in a combat zone in Korea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WARBURTON:

H. R. 2767. A bill to allow widows and certain other persons to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid in providing for the care of children under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLVERTON (by request):

H. R. 2768. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce

of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2769. A bill to amend section 704 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so as to protect the public health and welfare by restoring certain authority for factory inspections; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to assist the Polycultural Institution of America in expanding further its program and activities for the purpose of promoting universal understanding, justice, and permanent peace, to assist such institution in providing for its permanent plant and equipment in the Nation's Capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution to acknowledge, confirm, and establish the title of the States to the navigable waters and lands beneath such navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the nomination of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 172. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that a provision of a treaty which conflicts with any provision of the Constitution shall not be of any force or effect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to change the name of the Savannah River project in Georgia to the "Brien McMahon Atomic Energy Plant"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, into methods for its prevention and control, and for recovery of critical materials from atmospheric contaminants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain secret agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 134. Resolution directing the Civil Service Commission to furnish the House of Representatives with a list of Federal positions not under civil service rules and regulations, together with the names and home States of individuals occupying such positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 135. Resolution to bring about rescission of the order curtailing postal service of the Postmaster General; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature urging Congress to pass a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALLECK: Memorial of the Eighty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Indiana, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation repealing laws which require the States to collect Federal gasoline taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts concerning Federal Fair Employment Practices Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts concerning legislation to incorporate Franco-American War Veterans, Inc., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, relative to requesting that proper steps be taken that will effectively remove any discrimination against an honorably discharged Indian veteran and that all rights and privileges are accorded him that are enjoyed by his fellow comrades at arms; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging passage of legislation requiring that all imported trout sold in the United States be labeled as to its origin and the date of processing and that a fine be imposed upon any wholesale or retail handler removing said label; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2770. A bill for the relief of Tara Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 2771. A bill for the relief of Charles Anthony Desotell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2772. A bill for the relief of Jessie American Horse; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2773. A bill for the relief of Ruth Thunder Hoop; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2774. A bill for the relief of Endre Szende, Zsuzsanna Szende, Katalin Szende (a minor), and Maria Szende (a minor); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H. R. 2775. A bill for the relief of Kina Kenyel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 2776. A bill for the relief of Henry N. Hale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2777. A bill for the relief of Charles Gordon Furman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2778. A bill for the relief of Antonio Scorza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2779. A bill to provide for perfecting the title of C. A. Lundy to certain lands in the State of California heretofore patented by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2839. A bill to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2840. A bill for the transfer by the United States to the Territory of Hawaii of certain land in the city and County of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2841. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2842. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2843. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2844. A bill providing that the ratification of the revenue bond act of 1935, enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, shall apply to all amendments of said act made by said legislature to and including the acts of the 1951 regular session of said legislature, and to all extensions of the period for issuance and delivery of revenue bonds thereunder, heretofore or hereafter enacted by said legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2845. A bill to transfer to the Territory of Hawaii title to property heretofore set aside for the use of the University of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2846. A bill authorizing the President to exercise certain powers conferred upon him by the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect of certain property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii, notwithstanding the acts of August 5, 1939, and June 16, 1949, or other acts of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2847. A bill to make the calendar fixed and perpetual; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2848. A bill to amend section 89 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2849. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the transfer of land from the War Department to the Territory of Hawaii", approved June 19, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 2850. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to increase the annuities of present and future annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 2851. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2852. A bill to provide methods of obtaining on a voluntary basis the opinions of the qualified voters in each State on issues and questions of current national importance as an aid to the Federal Government in the formulation and execution of policy; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 2853. A bill to provide for the rescission of the order of the Postmaster General curtailing delivery of mail and certain other postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2854. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on purses, handbags, pocketbooks, and similar articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 2855. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to provide per-

manent price supports for oats, rye, barley, flax, grain sorghums, and soybeans at 95 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2856. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to provide that prices of basic agricultural commodities shall be supported at 95 percent of parity for the 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1957 crops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 2857. A bill to promote economy and efficiency in the operations of the executive branch of the Government by providing an equitable method of reducing the number of employees therein; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MCCULLOCH:

H. R. 2858. A bill to amend section 474 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the excess profits credit in the case of certain taxable acquisitions); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 2859. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to require manufacturers of farm machinery sold in interstate commerce to identify each such machine by a serial number; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2860. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 2861. A bill to permit deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by working mothers in providing care for their children while they are at work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2862. A bill to establish a Federal Board of Hospitalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2863. A bill to amend section 3801 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to mitigation of statute of limitations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2864. A bill to amend the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 by adding thereto a new subsection 432 (f); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2865. A bill to amend section 3801 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to mitigation of statute of limitations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRINGFELLOW:

H. R. 2866. A bill to permit veterans to suspend or delay their programs of education or training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 in order to perform services as missionaries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TALLE (by request):

H. R. 2867. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2868. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 2869. A bill to provide for the payment of increased special pensions to persons holding the Congressional Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2870. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2871. A bill to authorize the retirement of non-Regular officers of the Army and Air Force having more than 30 years active Federal service under the same conditions presently provided for such officers having less than 30 years service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WARBURTON:

H. R. 2872. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2873. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO (by request):

H. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the granting of patents and copyrights in perpetuity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for continuation of the emergency hay program of the Department of Agriculture until April 30, 1953; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FORD:

H. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution pertaining to the recent Netherlands disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution designating the month of February in each year as American Heart Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Ford Motor Co.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution establishing a bipartisan joint congressional committee to advise the President on foreign policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution designating the 26th day of May of each year, beginning with the year 1953, as National Hill Billy Music Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2023. A bill for the relief of William Kipf and Darold D. Selk; without amendment (Rept. No. 31). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2033. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Columbia Basin Orchard, the Seattle Association of Credit Men, and the Perham Fruit Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 32). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2158. A bill for the relief of Col. Harry F. Cunningham; without amendment (Rept. No. 33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2169. A bill for the relief of Louis A. Schafer; without amendment (Rept. No. 34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 759. A bill for the relief of Hisami Yoshida; without amendment (Rept. No. 35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 886. A bill for the relief of Aspasia Vezertzi; with an amendment (Rept. No. 36). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 861. A bill for the relief of Edith Marie Paulsen; without amendment (Rept. No. 37). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 960. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Lin (also known as Lin Chao Hsi); without amendment (Rept. No. 38). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 973. A bill for the relief of Margaret Celikcan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 39). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1193. A bill for the relief of Helga Josefa Wiley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 40). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1362. A bill for the relief of Rose Martin; with an amendment (Rept. No. 41). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1451. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James W. Tuten, Jr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 42). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1794. A bill for the relief of Yee Kee Lam; without amendment (Rept. No. 43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1895. A bill for the relief of Jack Kamal Samhat; with an amendment (Rept. No. 44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:
H. R. 2915. A bill to amend certain sections of chapter 21 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2916. A bill to authorize the retirement of non-Regular officers of the Army and Air Force having more than 30 years' active Federal service under the same conditions presently provided for such officers having less than 30 years' service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2917. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 2918. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2919. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, so as to insure that preference will be given in the acquisition of wool and wool products by the Federal Government, to wool produced and wool products manufactured within the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2920. A bill to amend section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2921. A bill to facilitate the management of certain land and recreational resources of reclamation projects in or adjacent to the national forests of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 2922. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 2923. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that individuals who shall have attained age 65 before July 1, 1952, may elect not to receive old-age and survivors insurance coverage with respect to self-employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 2924. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2925. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that old-age and other monthly insurance benefits shall be payable at age 60 in lieu of age 65, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2926. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn \$200 per month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 2927. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2928. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which may adversely affect competition or unduly tend to create a monopoly in the field of banking; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 2929. A bill to repeal those provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 which reduce the amount of the annuity or pension which an individual or his spouse receives under such act in cases where either the individual or his spouse is (or on proper application would be) entitled to certain insurance benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2930. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase from \$75 to \$175 per month the amount which may be earned without loss of old-age or survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 2931. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to extend from 3

to 5 years the period of limitations applicable to embezzlement, theft, fraud, robbery, and burglary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2932. A bill to provide for an Independent Consumers' Council to represent the consuming public before Government agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2933. A bill to provide that an individual who is entitled to a monthly insurance benefit under title II of the Social Security Act shall not be deprived of that benefit because of work performed by him or by the person on whose wage record that benefit is based; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2934. A bill to amend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 2935. A bill to repeal the \$75 work clause that applies to old-age and survivors insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2936. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of California for use as a fair-ground by the 10-A District Agricultural Association, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 2937. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2938. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a \$1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2939. A bill to establish in the Department of Commerce a Consumers' Advisory Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2940. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2941. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption to certain physically handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2942. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2943. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2944. A bill to provide income-tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 2945. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for dependent brothers and sisters, and other dependent relatives, of deceased individuals who were fully insured under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2946. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 2947. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 2948. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use

and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 2949. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949, so as to provide for import controls and modify the provisions relating to export controls for the protection of American agriculture, labor, and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H. R. 2950. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time during which requests may be made for reimbursement for damages to public airports resulting from military operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 2951. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. P. 2952. A bill to permit in certain cases children under 10 years of age who are to be adopted in the United States to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2953. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship by voting in a political election or plebiscite held in occupied Japan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H. R. 2954. A bill to amend section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1941 relating to the apportionment of moneys received on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2955. A bill to provide that, in determining the order of priority for registering and inducting doctors and dentists under the Selective Service Act of 1948, credit shall be given for all periods of active duty in the Armed Forces during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 2956. A bill to provide that amounts which do not exceed 51 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons; to the committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 2957. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 2958. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that individuals may deduct from gross income expenses paid or incurred for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2959. A bill to repeal the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 2960. A bill dividing the State of Florida into three judicial districts, defining the territory embraced in each, and fixing the time of holding terms of court therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. R. 2961. A bill to repeal those provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 which reduce the amount of a railroad annuity or pension where the individual or his spouse is (or on proper application would be) entitled to certain insurance benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2962. A bill to provide free postage for first-class letter mail matter sent by or to members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in foreign territory; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 2963. A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2964. A bill to allow percentage depletion of 15 percent for kyanite mines and deposits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 2965. A bill to allow percentage depletion of 15 percent for kyanite mines and deposits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 2966. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 2967. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 2968. A bill to reclassify supervisory employees in the field service of the Post Office Department into step-rate grades comparable with those for other postal employees and employees in other Federal services, and to adjust inequities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 2969. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property in Prince Georges County, Md., acquired as a site for the National Training School for Girls; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2970. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to expedite and facilitate the termination of railroad reorganization proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act and to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock-modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 2971. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2972. A bill to authorize an agreement between the United States and Mexico for the joint operation and maintenance by the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, of the Nogales sanitation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 2973. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 2974. A bill to add to the revised roll of the Indians of California certain Indians who made application for enrollment within the time fixed by law and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2975. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions all the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, and Camp Fire Girls, or similar organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2976. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of California for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2977. A bill to further amend the act of July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide

for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army" by removing certain limitations on the nature of personal injury and death claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2978. A bill to postpone reduction of education and training allowances to on-farm trainees under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 for 12 months to allow for completion of the first crop year or animal cycle; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2979. A bill to provide a further opportunity for veterans of World War II who were in active military, naval, or air service of the United States on the delimiting date for initiating a course of education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and who had not initiated a course prior to said date, to initiate such a course; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2980. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration," approved January 3, 1946, to provide for the use of qualified optometrists for out-patient eye care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 2981. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2982. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2983. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 2984. A bill to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 2985. A bill to expedite the replacement of lost keys to post-office lock boxes and drawers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 2986. A bill to allow a taxpayer to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for the care of dependents, while the taxpayer is employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2987. A bill to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2988. A bill for the relief of the city of Kirkland, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 2989. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions all the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the Camp Fire Girls, or similar organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2990. A bill to amend the act which incorporated the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2991. A bill to provide emergency relief for certain natives of the Netherlands and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **WARBURTON**:

H. R. 2992. A bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting blind or aged dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. **WITHROW**:

H. R. 2993. A bill to regulate the hours of service, compensatory time, and overtime in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2994. A bill to provide for temporary promotions in the field service of the Post Office Department to cover extended absences of 30 days or more; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. **YOUNGER**:

H. R. 2995. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2996. A bill making the 12th day of February in each year a legal holiday to be known as Lincoln's Birthday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **BUSBEY**:

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution establishing a commission to study Government competition with private taxpaying enterprise; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. **REED** of New York:

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **HAYS** of Arkansas:

H. Con. Res. 60. Joint resolution providing chapel facilities for Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. **FRANCES P. BOLTON**:

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution expressing sympathy for peoples of the Netherlands, Great Britain, and Belgium, in the recent flood and storm disaster; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. **FINE**:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. **DOLLINGER**:

H. Res. 139. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives with respect to the recent campaign of racial and religious persecution conducted by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. **KELLY** of New York:

H. Res. 140. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate and study the medical and hospital facilities and related activities of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. **HESELTON**: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to a higher minimum-wage law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the issuance of a certain commemorative postage stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to extend the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits to additional and certain other classes of employment and workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. **ALLEN** of California (by request):

H. R. 2997. A bill for the relief of Sprague B. Wyman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2998. A bill for the relief of Margot Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **AUCHINCLOSS**:

H. R. 2999. A bill for the relief of Sheri Lynn Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **BAILEY**:

H. R. 3000. A bill providing for the extension of Patent No. 2,053,981, issued September 8, 1936, relating to method and means for flowing wells; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3001. A bill for the relief of Nicholas M. Papadopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **BOLLING**:

H. R. 3002. A bill for the relief of Floyd Striltschuk Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **BRAMBLETT**:

H. R. 3003. A bill for the relief of Ernest Ludwig Bamford and Mrs. Nadine Bamford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3004. A bill for the relief of Bishara Lawrence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **BROWN** of Ohio:

H. R. 3005. A bill for the relief of Charles Sabah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3006. A bill for the relief of Ruth Irene Ledermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **BUSBEY**:

H. R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Muriel C. Jennings (nee Curtis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **CARLYLE**:

H. R. 3008. A bill for the relief of Esther Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **CURTIS** of Nebraska:

H. R. 3009. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amalia Grass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3010. A bill to provide for the reinstatement of William A. Burkett as a senior special agent, United States Treasury; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. **DAVIS** of Georgia:

H. R. 3011. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Soumplis (also known as Tom Makres); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **D'EWART**:

H. R. 3012. A bill for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **DONOHUE**:

H. R. 3013. A bill for the relief of Spyridon Saintoufis and Mrs. Efrassini Saintoufis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **GARY**:

H. R. 3014. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfred L. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **GORDON**:

H. R. 3015. A bill for the relief of the Wojcik family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **HELLER**:

H. R. 3016. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Lovinger and Szerin Lovinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3017. A bill for the relief of Felix Petrover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **HOLIFIELD**:

H. R. 3018. A bill for the relief of Edwin Walden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3019. A bill for the relief of Kui Hung Tam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3020. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Suzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3021. A bill for the relief of Morris Plevin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3022. A bill for the relief of Julien Musafia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3023. A bill for the relief of Kane-shige Kato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **HOLTZMAN**:

H. R. 3024. A bill for the relief of Sergio Emeric; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **IKARD**:

H. R. 3025. A bill for the relief of Lorna Agnes Romero (formerly Agnes Ishikawa) and Dorothy Ann Romero (formerly Shirol Moriyama); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **JONAS** of Illinois:

H. R. 3026. A bill for the relief of Barbara Gene Coster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **JONES** of Missouri:

H. R. 3027. A bill for the relief of Tamiko Nagae; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **KEOGH**:

H. R. 3028. A bill for the relief of Antonio Giovanni Sepe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3029. A bill for the relief of Rezziero Boccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **KILDAY**:

H. R. 3030. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Betty M. Boyersmith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **KLEIN**:

H. R. 3031. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Sentoukts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3032. A bill for the relief of Chin Yam Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **LANTAFF**:

H. R. 3033. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John R. Cleary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **LESINSKI**:

H. R. 3034. A bill for the relief of Frank Sopko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **MCCORMACK**:

H. R. 3035. A bill for the relief of Stephania Ziegler (Sister Benitia), Anna Hagel (Sister Clara) and Theresia Tuppingier (Sister Romana); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **MACHROWICZ**:

H. R. 3036. A bill for the relief of Noriko Niwa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **MACK** of Washington:

H. R. 3037. A bill for the relief of Cathryn A. Glesener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **O'BRIEN** of Michigan:

H. R. 3038. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Olympia Cuc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **POULSON**:

H. R. 3039. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Yip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **REED** of New York:

H. R. 3040. A bill for the relief of Jacob J. Schaftenaar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **REED** of Illinois:

H. R. 3041. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Frederick W. Lee the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain invention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **ROBSON** of Kentucky:

H. R. 3042. A bill for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **SIKES**:

H. R. 3043. A bill for the relief of Walter Jimmy Sims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **SMITH** of Mississippi:

H. R. 3044. A bill for the relief of Kim Ki Hang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **STEED**:

H. R. 3045. A bill for the relief of Nickolas K. Ioannides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **SMITH** of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3046. A bill for the relief of William Urban Maloney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1953

By Mr. GREEN:
S. 976. A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to correct injustice, and to provide for the payment of certain amounts of compensation to officers who were found under the provisions of that act to have been removed from the active list of the Army without justification and who were subsequently restored to the active list or advanced on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):
S. 977. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 978. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to expedite and facilitate the termination of railroad reorganization proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act and to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:
S. 979. A bill for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee; and

S. 980. A bill for the relief of Jang Kee Nam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:
S. 981. A bill to provide for the renewal of patent No. 1,858,087; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY:
S. 982. A bill for the relief of Helena Lewicka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:
S. 983. A bill to carry out the recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission with respect to duty concessions on Swiss watch movements; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARRAN:
S. 984. A bill making provision for judicial review of certain Tax Court decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:
S. 985. A bill for the relief of Cesare Mazzonetto, Alma Zane Mazzonetto, Luciano Mazzonetto, and Mario Adriano Mazzonetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:
S. 986. A bill for the relief of Ishi Washburn and Terry Wendell Washburn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:
S. 987. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the centennial celebration of the founding of the city of Northampton, Mass.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 988. A bill for the relief of August Alcsuti and Vilma Kann Alcsuti;

S. 989. A bill for the relief of Jean Jing Peo Feng;

S. 990. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes;

S. 991. A bill for the relief of Yoko Itabashi;

S. 992. A bill for the relief of Apostolos Savvas Vassiliadis; and

S. 993. A bill for the relief of Dr. Suzanne Can Amerongen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. NEELY):

S. 994. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and their subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public health units,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:
S. 995. A bill for the relief of Margarete Lilly Tschiga;

S. 996. A bill for the relief of Margarete Emellanoff;

S. 997. A bill for the relief of Chuan Hua Lowe and his wife; and

S. 998. A bill to amend section 324A of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for the nationalization of certain aliens serving in the Armed Forces in time of war or hostilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. BARNETT, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. TOBEY):

S. 999. A bill to provide an elected city council, school board, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, at the request of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, I introduce for appropriate reference six bills. I am introducing the bills at this time in order that they may be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia so the committee may then refer them to the appropriate subcommittees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. CASE (by request):
S. 1000. A bill to revive section 3 of the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 1001. A bill to amend the act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1045, 1057, ch. 422), to provide for the appointment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of special policemen, and for other purposes;

S. 1002. A bill to remove restrictions on the use of a portion of square 355 in the District of Columbia, acquired by the District of Columbia as part of a site for a wholesale farmers' produce market;

S. 1003. A bill to provide for the financing of open-air concerts and free children's concerts by the National Symphony Orchestra and for other purposes;

S. 1004. A bill to amend section 86, Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the District of Columbia, as amended; and

S. 1005. A bill to amend the Boiler Inspection Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1006. A bill to promote greater economy in the operations of the Federal Government by providing for a consolidated cash budget, a separation of operating from capital expenditures, the scheduling of legislative action on appropriation measures, year-and-day votes on amendments to appropriation measures, and a presidential item veto; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:
S. 1007. A bill for the relief of Spiros A. Magoulas;

S. 1008. A bill for the relief of Adamantios Arakas; and

S. 1009. A bill for the relief of Zoltan Weingarten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:
S. 1010. A bill to provide that licenses granted by the Federal Power Commission for power projects in the international section of the St. Lawrence River shall be conditioned so as to assure marketing preferences to public agencies and cooperatives; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLEMENTS:
S. 1011. A bill for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:
S. 1012. A bill to provide certain benefits for members of reserve components of the Army and Air Force who suffer disability or death from disease while engaged in inactive duty training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1013 (by request). A bill providing that the title to certain lands within the Stockbridge-Munsee Indian Reservation, Wis., shall be held in trust for the use of the Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Inc., and for other purposes; and

S. 1014 (by request). A bill to amend the act of Congress of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085), as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1015. A bill for the relief of Sister Concepts (Ida Riegel); and

S. 1016. A bill for the relief of Josephine Schaitel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:
S. 1017. A bill relating to the rights of the several States in tidelands and in lands beneath navigable inland waters, and to the recognition of equities in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG:
S. 1018. A bill for the relief of George Ellis Ellison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:
S. 1019. A bill to provide a channel across St. George Island from the Gulf of Mexico into Apalachicola Bay, Fla.

S. 1020. A bill to authorize the construction of a channel at East Point in Apalachicola Bay, Fla.; and

S. 1021. A bill to authorize the dredging of a boat basin at Apalachicola, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE:
S. 1022. A bill for the relief of L. R. Swarthout and the legal guardian of Harold Swarthout; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1023. A bill to supplement the railway safety appliance acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1024. A bill to provide for the distribution of the proceeds of certain judgments awarded the Confederate Bands of Umpqua and Calapooia Indians of the Umpqua Valley and the Mo-lai-la-las or Molei Tribe of Indians by the Court of Claims; and

S. 1025. A bill to provide for the distribution of the proceeds of certain judgments awarded the Alcea Band of Tillamooks, Coquille Tribe, Too-too-to-ney Tribe and the Chetco Tribe of Indians by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the last three above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

S. 1248. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Donald McIntyre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 1249. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1250. A bill to amend section 604 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1251. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, relating to veterans' exemptions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. CASE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HENNING, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HILL, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1252. A bill relating to the rights of the several States in tidelands and in lands beneath navigable inland waters, and to the recognition of equities in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1253. A bill to aid in meeting the defense mobilization requirements of the United States by providing for the training or retraining of civilian aviation personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1254. A bill to establish effective means to determine Communist domination in unions and to eliminate Communists from positions of influence and control in labor unions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1255. A bill to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1169), as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 672 (a)), and secs. 5 and 302 of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 1935 and 1992), as amended (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 672 (a) and 1132); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1256. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1257. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Seattle, Wash., as the Hiram R. Gale Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 1258. A bill to provide increased annuities to certain civilian officials and employees who performed service in the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1259. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Kondylis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1260. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Else Pope; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1261. A bill relating to the disposition of moneys received from the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct popular election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

SURPLUS FOOD AND CLOTHING FOR KOREA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, the purpose of which is to provide surplus food and clothing for Korea. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement, and read a one-page letter which I have addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

The bill (S. 1230) to provide for the strengthening of the Republic of Korea as an ally against aggression and for the reconstruction of that country from the ravages of war in resisting aggression, introduced by Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. MUNDT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have today written a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, which reads as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1953.

The Honorable EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Attached you will find a copy of an informal draft of a bill which I propose to introduce in the Senate today which would authorize you to sell the Republic of Korea food and clothing commodities and to receive in payment legal currency of the Republic of Korea. The exact form and details are subject to revision, of course, but I hope that the general proposition will appeal to you and may have your support.

You will note that the bill also directs the Treasury to credit such currency against debentures of the Commodity Credit Corporation and to place it in a Korean Reconstruction Fund and creates a Joint Committee of the Congress to investigate conditions in Korea and recommend a program of reconstruction through the use of the fund so created.

On February 26, the Associated Press reported Korean Defense Minister Shin Tae Young as saying: "The ROK soldier is getting only about one-third the calories he needs from rice and a few side dishes."

Last week, in the Senate Committee on Armed Services we heard Lt. Gen. James Van Fleet say that both the military and civilian populations of South Korea were living on a diet below that which we provide for our prisoners of war under the Geneva convention.

General Van Fleet also testified that fewer South Korean troops would go to the hospital, that more South Korean men could qualify for military service, that efficiency at the front would be improved if they had a better diet. He also said that many of the civilians are wearing the ragged remnants of the clothes they had on their backs when the invasion took place almost 3 years ago.

Eventually, the United States will rehabilitate South Korea. That would be in keeping with our traditions and the spirit of our people toward an ally to say nothing of the destruction occasioned by our own troop movements.

Why not help ourselves by helping the South Koreans now—using some of the fiber and food products which the Commodity Credit Corporation is buying—thereby translating these growing stocks into strength at the front and providing the local currency funds that can be used in Korean rehabilitation later on?

Using food to win the war and build the peace beats putting bluing on potatoes or burning wheat or killing pigs.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANCIS CASE,

United States Senator, South Dakota.

I may say that this is in keeping with policies which the United States has followed in connection with the rehabilitation of other allies at present associated with us in war. Whenever foodstocks are approaching the point of deterioration, instead of keeping them on hand, it seems to me that if it is possible we should convert such stocks into food and distribute it to the South Korean soldiers at the front, so as to improve their condition and morale and help to provide more South Korean soldiers for the front. Likewise, the legal currency of Korea should be acquired so that it may be used for the reconstruction of Korea following the war.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, through the facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire domestic supplies of wool, cotton, grains, dairy, poultry and meat products and to sell and deliver such commodities to the Republic of South Korea in an amount not exceeding \$500 million under the authority of this act, and to accept legal currency of the Republic of Korea in payment therefor. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, insofar as practicable, utilize stocks of such commodities as may be acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Secretary in carrying out other provisions of existing law.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive from the Secretary of Agriculture currency of the Republic of Korea acquired pursuant to the authority of section 1 of this act and to credit such receipts in payment for and retirement of debentures or other evidences of indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Treasury and to deposit this currency in a special fund for Korean reconstruction and rehabilitation.

Sec. 3. There is hereby created a Joint Select Committee on Korean Reconstruction and Rehabilitation to consist of 5 members from the Senate of the United States to be named by the President of the Senate and 5 members from the House of Representatives to be named by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. This committee shall investigate the economic and social conditions of South Korea growing out of the resistance of the Republic of Korea to aggression and shall report its findings to the Congress not later than Jan.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 1378. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide full annuity for individuals who have completed 30 years of service; to provide annuities thereunder equal to 50 percent of the average monthly salaries or wages based on the 5 years of highest earnings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1379. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to certain employees in the postal transportation service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1380. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 1381. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Five Civilized Tribes and other Indians of eastern Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1382. A bill to provide that the procedural limitations placed upon the conveyance of certain restricted Indian lands belonging to members of the Five Civilized Tribes shall apply only to Indians of the full blood; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1383. A bill to provide for distribution of moneys of deceased restricted members of the Five Civilized Tribes not exceeding \$500, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 1384. A bill for improvement of the inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1385. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (2), Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 10), relating to income-tax exemption of certain employees, by including certain veterans' organization employees, and others; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 1386. A bill to create the office of Delegate at Large in the House of Representatives for ex-Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 1387. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1388. A bill relating to the amount of gross income which a dependent of a taxpayer may have without loss by the taxpayer of an income-tax exemption for such dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1389. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who are involuntarily separated after having rendered 20 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1390. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1391. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1392. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt from taxation annuities of retired employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1393. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt payments under said act from taxation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1394. A bill to provide for salary increases for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1395. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1396. A bill to create a Federal corporation to improve the efficiency, morale, health, and general welfare of Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. Lecompte:

H. R. 1397. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 1398. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 1399. A bill to authorize the construction of certain flood-control improvements on the Calumet Union drainage ditch in the vicinity of Harvey, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 1400. A bill to increase to \$1,000 the amount a dependent may earn without loss of exemption to the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1401. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1402. A bill to terminate the war-tax rate on admissions to theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1403. A bill to provide for promotion by merit of employees in the postal service and to establish uniform procedures for examination and appointment of candidates for promotion to supervisory positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1404. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to provide for payment of overtime compensation to substitute employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 1405. A bill to authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers to reevaluate certain rivers and harbors and flood-control projects in order to determine the advisability of prosecuting such projects to completion; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1406. A bill to provide that an individual who is entitled to a monthly insurance benefit under title II of the Social Security Act shall not be deprived of that benefit because of work performed by him or by the person on whose wage record that benefit is based; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 1407. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1952 for the construction and improvement of the national system of interstate highways designated in accordance with section 7 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1408. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn \$100 per month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1409. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1410. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 1411. A bill to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1412. A bill to provide for the construction of a Post Office Terminal in Denver, Colo., on the site which has been acquired by the United States for that purpose; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1413. A bill to amend subparagraph (k) of paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize compensation for blindness of one eye with 5/200 visual acuity or less; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 1414. A bill to authorize the transfer of hospitals and related facilities between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 1415. A bill to allow to a retail dealer in gasoline a refund of the Federal tax paid on gasoline which is lost by the retailer through evaporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1416. A bill to provide rates of pay for training periods of substitute rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1417. A bill to amend section 2000 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the tax on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMALL:

H. R. 1418. A bill to amend the Hatch Act to permit all officers and employees of the Government to take an active part in political management or political campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 1419. A bill to provide that standard time shall be the measure of time for all purposes and to authorize Congress to establish daylight-saving time for any year by concurrent resolution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1420. A bill to provide a system of transcontinental superhighways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1421. A bill to create a Department of Peace; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 1422. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 1423. A bill to repeal the excise taxes on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1424. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Thomas B. Curtis, Missouri; Victor A. Michigan; James B. Utt, California.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MINORITY MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 81) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives: Jere Cooper, Tennessee; John D. Dingell, Michigan; Wilbur D. Mills, Arkansas; Noble J. Gregory, Kentucky; A. Sidney Camp, Georgia; Alme J. Forand, Rhode Island; Herman P. Eberharter, Pennsylvania; Cecil R. King, California; Thomas J. O'Brien, Illinois; Hale Boggs, Louisiana.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINORITY MEMBERSHIP OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 82) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: Clarence Cannon, Missouri; George H. Mahon, Texas; Harry R. Sheppard, California; Albert Thomas, Texas; Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio; W. P. Norrell, Arkansas; Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi; George W. Andrews, Alabama; John J. Rooney, New York; J. Vaughan Gary, Virginia; John E. Fogarty, Rhode Island; Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; Prince H. Preston, Jr., Georgia; Otto E. Passman, Louisiana; Louis C. Rabaut, Michigan; Sidney R. Yates, Illinois; Fred Marshall, Minnesota; John J. Riley, South Carolina; Alfred D. Sieminski, New Jersey.

Committee on House Administration: Thomas B. Stanley, Virginia; Omar Burleson, Texas; Charles B. Deane, North Carolina; Edward S. Garmatz, Maryland; Ken Regan, Texas; James W. Trimble, Arkansas.

Committee on Rules: Howard W. Smith, Virginia; William M. Colmer, Mississippi; Ray J. Madden, Indiana; John E. Lyle, Jr., Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 83) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittees thereof be authorized to sit during sessions and recesses of the Eighty-third Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SUTTON.

Mr. GAVIN and to include an editorial.

Mr. JENKINS and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. HYDE and to include an editorial with regard to Senator BEALL.

Mr. LATHAM and to include extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$280.

Mr. OSTERTAG.

Mr. BROTHILL and to include an editorial with regard to Representative SMITH of Virginia.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin and to include extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$189.

Mr. YORTY in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL in two instances.

Mr. HOWELL.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Friday, January 16, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

328. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom" was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 1706. A bill to expedite admission of certain adopted children of American citizens; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

H. R. 1707. A bill to authorize the issuance of 300,000 special nonquota immigration visas to certain refugees, persons of German ethnic origin, and natives of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 1708. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that old-age and other monthly insurance benefits shall be payable at age 69 in lieu of at age 65, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1709. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a minimum average monthly wage of \$100 for purposes of computing the amount of old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 1710. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 1711. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1712. A bill to provide automobiles for veterans of World War I who are entitled to compensation for the loss of use of one or both legs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1713. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 1714. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931 and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 1715. A bill to punish the use of interstate commerce in furtherance of conspiracies to commit organized crime offenses against any of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 1716. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the operation and maintenance of the Central Valley project, California, to the State of California or an agency thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 1717. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1718. A bill to provide that an individual who is entitled to a monthly insurance benefit under title II of the Social Security Act shall not be deprived of that benefit because of work performed by him or by the person on whose wage record that benefit is based; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1719. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption to certain physically handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1720. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the meaning of "outside salesman"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Louisiana Purchase; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1919. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that annuities received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1920. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to collective-bargaining contracts which have been in existence for a continuous period of 20 years or more; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEWART:

H. R. 1921. A bill to settle possessory land claims in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 1922. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that those monthly insurance benefits which under present law are not payable until age 65 shall hereafter be payable at age 60 in the case of men and at age 55 in the case of women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 1923. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1924. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of heliports on or near Government buildings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1925. A bill to aid in meeting the defense mobilization requirements of the United States by providing for the training or retraining of civilian aviation personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1926. A bill to provide for Federal participation in the design, development, and service testing of jet-transport aircraft in the manner recommended by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1927. A bill to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees' overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1928. A bill to authorize the inter-service transfers of officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 1929. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to prohibit the grading of livestock and to remove price ceilings from livestock; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1930. A bill to grant permanent and total disability ratings to veterans suffering from severe industrial inadaptability as a result of war service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 1931. A bill to set aside Executive Order No. 10426 relating to submerged lands of the Continental Shelf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 1932. A bill to terminate certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1933. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 396, relating to the importing and transporting of obscene books and other material; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 1934. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to historical sites and museums operated by the United States, the several States, or po-

litical subdivisions thereof, or by any municipality; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 1935. A bill to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 1936. A bill authorizing the acceptance, for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, of school board land in exchange for park land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 1937. A bill to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1938. A bill to create the position of mail handler in charge in the Postal Transportation Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1939. A bill to authorize films, and related material, for educational use to be transmitted through the mails at the rate provided for books; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 1940. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn \$125 a month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 1941. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1942. A bill to provide that voluntary agreements for the coverage of State and local employees under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may include positions covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITTHROW:

H. R. 1943. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), to provide overtime compensation for employees of the Postal Transportation Service for service in excess of 32 hours performed in any calendar week in which a holiday occurs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 1944. A bill to amend Section 1020c, Title 12, Banks and Banking, United States Code, and to provide for payment by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation of the unpaid balance due on defaulted joint-stock land bank bonds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution defining certain terms, defining and extending certain boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. Res. 102. Resolution authorizing and directing an inquiry by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives into the commercial and proprietary activities of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 103. Resolution for the relief of Ida Seringer Sanford, widow of Robert Edgar Sanford, late an employee of the House of

Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 1945. A bill for the relief of J. Don Alexander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 1946. A bill for the relief of Hugo Nicolas Solamo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1947. A bill for the relief of Nelson Shig-Liang Sheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1948. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fung Hwa Liu Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1949. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Nakamura Takimoto and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1950. A bill for the relief of the Union Oil Co. of California and the Matson Navigation Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1951. A bill for the relief of Hebbani Krishnamurthi Jai Raj; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1952. A bill for the relief of Cecile Lorraine Vincent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1953. A bill for the relief of Paula Vetter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 1954. A bill for the relief of Edward B. Palmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1955. A bill for the relief of Alvio Innamorati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1956. A bill for the relief of Khadr Su'od Sa'd ed Din; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1957. A bill for the relief of Abdel Karim Ahmad Ali Sham'a, also known as Abdel Sham'a; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1958. A bill for the relief of Khalil Abus Su'd Sa'd ed Din, also known as Charlie Sood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 1959. A bill for the relief of Nakako Kano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1960. A bill for the relief of Grace Owsley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1961. A bill for the relief of Leonard Gargano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. R. 1962. A bill for the relief of the Edwards Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 1963. A bill for the relief of Anna Schillings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1964. A bill for the relief of the Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1965. A bill for the relief of Khalil S. A. Aoun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 1966. A bill for the relief of Szilagyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 1967. A bill to reimburse the Bins Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 1968. A bill for the relief of Demarest Swift, Anne Hathaway Swift, Samuel Hyde Swift; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2448. A bill making an appropriation for the construction of a building for the Bureau of Mines, authorized under section 101 of the Public Buildings Act of 1949, on a site in Mount Hope, W. Va., which has been donated to the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 2449. A bill to establish a Bureau of Clinics for the treatment of chronic alcoholics and narcotics addicts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2450. A bill to credit the Oglala Sioux Tribe with the proceeds of Oglala Sioux tribal lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2451. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to prohibit the grading of livestock and to remove price ceilings from livestock; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 2452. A bill to provide dispensary treatment and hospitalization in Army and Navy hospitals for retired enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2453. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2454. A bill to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 2455. A bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting blind or aged dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 2456. A bill to amend the act of October 11, 1951, authorizing the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. R. 2457. A bill for improvement of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet and the Mobile to New Orleans Intracoastal Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 2458. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain land located at Cherry Point, N. C., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 2459. A bill to reduce the rate of postage on third-class matter consisting of sample ballots and other official election material mailed by States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2460. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2461. A bill to regulate the subsistence, expenses, and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 2462. A bill to waive, in the case of certain veterans of World War I over 70 years of age, the income limitation restricting their right to receive non-service-connected disability compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2463. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2464. A bill to amend the Federal Highway Act so as to permit the charging of tolls, under certain conditions, on federally aided highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2465. A bill to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2466. A bill to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2467. A bill to permit shipment by mail of live scorpions to be used for medical research purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 2468. A bill to promote equal treatment for disabled veterans by providing that the increase in compensation granted by the first section of the act of May 23, 1952, shall be 15 percent in all cases, without regard to degree of disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SECREST (by request):

H. R. 2469. A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to dependents' parents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 2470. A bill to provide for the issuing of policies of national service life insurance to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 2471. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 2472. A bill to channel into Government hands excess production of basic commodities needed for defense purposes and to prevent the price depressive effects of such production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 2473. A bill to provide for dissolution of interstate bank holding companies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2474. A bill to provide equitable compensation for Saturday, Sunday, holiday, and overtime duty in the Federal Government service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2475. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2476. A bill to regulate subsistence, expenses, and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 2477. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 2478. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to designate 1953 as the fiftieth anniversary year of farm

demonstration work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution declaring the Yalta agreement null and void and not binding on the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Res. 130. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study regarding the reestablishment of cartels, resumption of power by former Nazis, and resurgence of fascism and anti-Semitism in Germany; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature relative to passing legislation to incorporate Franco-American War Veterans, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relating to their senate joint resolution No. 9, relative to the shortage of hospital beds for California veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to requesting the enactment of such remedial legislation as may be necessary to permit the deduction from income taxes of expenses incurred for travel to and from work, expenses incurred by working mothers and fathers for the care and maintenance of minor children, and to exempt from income taxes remuneration received by coal miners in the form of miner's pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relative to requesting certain changes in the field of taxation so as to give several States of the Union an increased opportunity to levy additional taxes without increasing the burden of the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to requesting the enactment of legislation forbidding the shipment of raw garbage across State lines for feeding purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to requesting taking action regarding the land to be inundated by the Missouri River development, the appraisal of said land, the people dispossessed and other pertinent matters in relation thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of Washington, extending its felicitations, and its earnest and sincere best wishes to the new national administration, under the leadership of the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. R. 2479. A bill for the relief of Spauldine Furniture Co., Inc., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2480. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Margarita Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2481. A bill for the relief of Dulin G. Westfall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 2482. A bill for the relief of Barbara Jeanne Kane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1248. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Donald McIntyre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 1249. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1250. A bill to amend section 604 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1251. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, relating to veterans' exemptions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. CASE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HENNING, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HILL, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1252. A bill relating to the rights of the several States in tidelands and in lands beneath navigable inland waters, and to the recognition of equities in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1253. A bill to aid in meeting the defense mobilization requirements of the United States by providing for the training or retraining of civilian aviation personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1254. A bill to establish effective means to determine Communist domination in unions and to eliminate Communists from positions of influence and control in labor unions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1255. A bill to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1169), as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 672 (a)), and secs. 5 and 302 of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 1935 and 1992), as amended (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 672 (a) and 1132); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1256. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1257. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Seattle, Wash., as the Hiram R. Gale Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 1258. A bill to provide increased annuities to certain civilian officials and employees who performed service in the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1259. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Kondylis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1260. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Else Pope; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1261. A bill relating to the disposition of moneys received from the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct popular election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

SURPLUS FOOD AND CLOTHING FOR KOREA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, the purpose of which is to provide surplus food and clothing for Korea. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement, and read a one-page letter which I have addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

The bill (S. 1230) to provide for the strengthening of the Republic of Korea as an ally against aggression and for the reconstruction of that country from the ravages of war in resisting aggression, introduced by Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. MUNDT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have today written a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, which reads as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1953.
The Honorable EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Attached you will find a copy of an informal draft of a bill which I propose to introduce in the Senate today which would authorize you to sell the Republic of Korea food and clothing commodities and to receive in payment legal currency of the Republic of Korea. The exact form and details are subject to revision, of course, but I hope that the general proposition will appeal to you and may have your support.

You will note that the bill also directs the Treasury to credit such currency against debentures of the Commodity Credit Corporation and to place it in a Korean Reconstruction Fund and creates a Joint Committee of the Congress to investigate conditions in Korea and recommend a program of reconstruction through the use of the fund so created.

On February 26, the Associated Press reported Korean Defense Minister Shin Tae Young as saying: "The ROK soldier is getting only about one-third the calories he needs from rice and a few side dishes."

Last week, in the Senate Committee on Armed Services we heard Lt. Gen. James Van Fleet say that both the military and civilian populations of South Korea were living on a diet below that which we provide for our prisoners of war under the Geneva convention.

General Van Fleet also testified that fewer South Korean troops would go to the hospital, that more South Korean men could qualify for military service, that efficiency at the front would be improved if they had a better diet. He also said that many of the civilians are wearing the ragged remnants of the clothes they had on their backs when the invasion took place almost 3 years ago.

Eventually, the United States will rehabilitate South Korea. That would be in keeping with our traditions and the spirit of our people toward an ally to say nothing of the destruction occasioned by our own troop movements.

Why not help ourselves by helping the South Koreans now—using some of the fiber and food products which the Commodity Credit Corporation is buying—thereby translating these growing stocks into strength at the front and providing the local currency funds that can be used in Korean rehabilitation later on?

Using food to win the war and build the peace beats putting bluing on potatoes or burning wheat or killing pigs.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senator, South Dakota.

I may say that this is in keeping with policies which the United States has followed in connection with the rehabilitation of other allies at present associated with us in war. Whenever foodstocks are approaching the point of deterioration, instead of keeping them on hand, it seems to me that if it is possible we should convert such stocks into food and distribute it to the South Korean soldiers at the front, so as to improve their condition and morale and help to provide more South Korean soldiers for the front. Likewise, the legal currency of Korea should be acquired so that it may be used for the reconstruction of Korea following the war.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, through the facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire domestic supplies of wool, cotton, grains, dairy, poultry and meat products and to sell and deliver such commodities to the Republic of South Korea in an amount not exceeding \$500 million under the authority of this act, and to accept legal currency of the Republic of Korea in payment therefor. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, insofar as practicable, utilize stocks of such commodities as may be acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Secretary in carrying out other provisions of existing law.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive from the Secretary of Agriculture currency of the Republic of Korea acquired pursuant to the authority of section 1 of this act and to credit such receipts in payment for and retirement of debentures or other evidences of indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Treasury and to deposit this currency in a special fund for Korean reconstruction and rehabilitation.

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a Joint Select Committee on Korean Reconstruction and Rehabilitation to consist of 5 members from the Senate of the United States to be named by the President of the Senate and 5 members from the House of Representatives to be named by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. This committee shall investigate the economic and social conditions of South Korea growing out of the resistance of the Republic of Korea to aggression and shall report its findings to the Congress not later than Jan.

June 25, 1942, relating to the making of photographs and sketches of properties of the Military Establishment, to continue in effect the provisions thereof until 6 months after the present national emergency; with amendment (Rept. No. 385). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1530. An act to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment in the grade of first lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and appointment with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) of nurses in the Regular Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1546. An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button; without amendment (Rept. No. 387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1547. An act to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1550. An act to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom; with amendment (Rept. No. 389). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2226. A bill to repeal the provision of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to pay of civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2319. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective Departments, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 193. Joint resolution to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 80th anniversary year of controlled powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1932, to December 17, 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MERROW: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs pursuant to House Resolution 113, 83d Congress, a resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee. Report of the special study mission to Pakistan, India, Thailand, and Indochina; without amendment (Rept. No. 412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5134. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 232. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4198. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural re-

sources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf; without amendment (Rept. No. 414). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 233. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5134, a bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 415). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 685. A bill for the relief of Walter Carl Sander; with amendment (Rept. 375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 783. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung; with amendment (Rept. No. 376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1345. A bill for the relief of John Lampropoulos; without amendment (Rept. No. 377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3522. A bill for the relief of Arthur S. Roschman; without amendment (Rept. No. 378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4048. A bill for the relief of the Maxwell Hardware Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4432. A bill for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham; with amendment (Rept. No. 380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 166. An act for the relief of Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir; without amendment (Rept. No. 393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 167. An act for the relief of Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo; without amendment (Rept. No. 394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 193. An act for the relief of Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki); without amendment (Rept. No. 395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 207. An act for the relief of Jimmy Okuda; without amendment (Rept. No. 396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 371. An act for the relief of Georgia Andrews; without amendment (Rept. No. 397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 709. An act to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Col. J. Claude Kimbrough; without amendment (Rept. No. 398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 20. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 665. A bill for the

relief of N. A. G. L. Moerings, Mrs. Bertha Johanna Krayenbrink Moerings, and Lambertus Karel Aloysius Josef Moerings; without amendment (Rept. No. 400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 761. A bill for the relief of Porfirio Punciano Villa, Tatiana Abatooroff Villa, Porfirio P. Villa, Jr., Anne Marie Villa, and Josephine Anne Villa; with amendment (Rept. No. 401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 765. A bill for the relief of Tien Koo Chen; without amendment (Rept. No. 402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 847. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Rickards, Conception Sotelo Rickards, and Walter John Rickards; without amendment (Rept. No. 403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 869. A bill for the relief of Masuko Oshima; with amendment (Rept. No. 404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1756. A bill to stay deportation proceedings on Eugene de Thassy; with amendment (Rept. No. 405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Paul Myung Ha Chung; with amendment (Rept. No. 406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1963. A bill for the relief of Anneliese Schillings; with amendment (Rept. No. 407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2351. A bill for the relief of Sam Rosenblat; without amendment (Rept. No. 408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2652. A bill for the relief of Constance Brouwer Scheffer; without amendment (Rept. No. 409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2787. A bill for the relief of Josefina Hoorn (Dmytruk); without amendment (Rept. No. 410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3670. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Gamroth; with amendment (Rept. No. 411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRAHAM:
H. R. 5134. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:
H. R. 5135. A bill relating to the repacking of fresh vegetables which have been, or are to be, transported in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:
H. R. 5136. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORBETT:
H. R. 5137. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to establish the hours of work for rural carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SUBMERGED LANDS ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up the House Resolution 233, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto for final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the consideration of this rule because it attempts to make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 5134, which is a bill to amend a nonexistent act.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the point of order that has been raised by the gentleman from Ohio is not one within the jurisdiction of the Chair, but is a question for the House to decide, whether it wants to consider such legislation.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already ruled.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who is opposed to this rule, although there may be two or three. I have no requests for time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I do not want to take any time at this point but I do not want the gentleman's remarks to remain unchallenged that there is no one opposed to the rule, because I expect to vote against the rule and I know of several others who will vote against the rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say I know of no other person.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we are asked to do something which is rather unprecedented this morning, most anomalous, in my humble opinion. You may recall that we passed the so-called offshore bill which contained three titles, three separate titles, I, II, and III. Title I involved definitions. Title II appertained to submerged minerals seaward to traditional State boundaries. Title III appertained to the minerals seaward from the State boundaries outward to the Continental Shelf. In the Senate title III was stricken from the bill.

I repeat, title III appertains to the mineral deposits in the lands seaward from the traditional State boundaries clear to the Continental Shelf. Ordinarily bills passed differently in the two bodies would go to conference and the conference would resolve or attempt to resolve the differences between the two Houses; instead, this rule, as a result of an agreement, would make in order the consideration by this body of the Senate bill which, as I said, contains only title I and title II which appertain to the offshore deposits from the low-water mark to the traditional State boundary.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I have only 5 minutes and have not yet expressed what I wanted to say to the House, but I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I just wanted to say to the gentleman that the Senate bill which contains title I and title II is not made in order by this rule; this rule makes in order the bill dealing with so-called title III, or lands on the Continental Shelf beyond the traditional State boundaries.

Mr. CELLER. I am referring to the second rule which also was passed by the Rules Committee and which we shall next consider. The first rule is for H. R. 5134—the Graham bill. We are confronted this morning with two rules, one referred to making in order the Senate bill, and the present or instant rule making in order consideration of a bill H. R. 5134 which refers to title III primarily but which was given scant attention by the Judiciary Committee to which it was referred.

It might be argued that title III was debated fore and aft when the general bill was before us, but I will say that the administration—and I turn my attention to those on my left—the administration officials who appeared before our committee indicated that they wanted a bundle bill; they wanted a bill containing all these titles. They stated that they did not want them to be considered separately—title I and title II as distinguished from title III.

The point was raised by the gentleman from Ohio that we are actually attempting in this bill to amend something that is nonexistent.

This bill, this H. R. 5434 would amend the so-called Submerged Lands Act, but

there is presently no Submerged Lands Act in existence. In my long experience in the House I do not remember when we were called upon to do just that: namely, amend an act not yet passed. There may have been some exceptions during the war because of the emergency, when we did that. We did unusual acts during the war in the interest of speed. But what is the need for hurrying now? I can conceive of no reason for rushing this bill, as was the case yesterday before the Judiciary Committee.

An announcement was made on the floor that there would be an executive meeting of the Judiciary Committee. Very few members were present. The matter was very cursorily considered before the Judiciary Committee yesterday morning. There was no debate. There was only the exhortation to hurry. There was opposition to the procedure. Eight members of the Judiciary Committee voted against the bill. All of them were not opposed in principle to the bill, but they registered thereby their protest against this rush proposition. Twelve members voted for the bill. That means there were 20 members present out of a membership of 30. A number of members said this morning they had not received the notice of meeting, which was by telephone. I only received the notice by chance. I happened to speak to one of the members and he asked: "Are you going to meeting?" I asked, "What meeting?" I was told what the meeting was. The meeting was not in an unusual meeting room but in the auxiliary room of the Ways and Means Committee, of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, for the reason stated I think it is wrong for us to be pushed into the acceptance of these two rules in this fashion. I shall oppose both, if only to register emphatically my protest against the highhanded procedure. There should have been the usual conference.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I need not remind my colleagues that this matter of submerged lands legislation has been before the Congress and the country for a long, long time. Pages and pages of debate, some of it relevant and some of it highly irrelevant, have been devoted to this subject. I do not know how others may feel about it, but, as far as I am concerned, I want to get this behind us. I want to be done with it, done with it in as good a fashion as we can work out, but once and for all let us decide it and have it behind us.

The gentleman from New York stated that this rule makes in order an amendment to legislation that has not yet been enacted. But let me point out that is completely procedural. It is a matter for the House to determine. Of course, if it should be that titles I and II as they will be sent to the White House are vetoed, then what we are seeking to do would be of no consequence, but I think we all understand that that result is

not going to come about. So what we are doing here, in my opinion, is getting at this proposition in a most orderly manner.

What the gentleman from New York stated as to the actions of the Judiciary Committee, I suppose, has a certain amount of merit, but, on the other hand, it was largely a formality of procedure because just a few short days ago the House of Representatives acted on this whole proposition after careful consideration by the great Committee on the Judiciary, which reported to the House after full and thorough debate here.

Titles I, II, and III were all open to amendment. Amendments were offered and arguments were made. Some favored titles I and II but not title III, and some favored title III but not titles I and II. But, in any event, we did debate it and we did act on it and the House of Representatives came to a conclusion.

All that we are here seeking to do so far as title III is concerned is to enact that title as it was previously adopted by the House of Representatives. One would hardly think that this was an earth shaking proposition requiring any exhortation of the great Committee on the Judiciary which after all, as I pointed out, is seeking only to cooperate with us in getting this matter decided once and for all.

Now, it is true that so far as our committee was concerned in the previous action it was determined to put the matter all in one package, to deal with the historic boundaries of the States and their rights within those historic boundaries—something I have supported throughout the years—and likewise to deal with the Continental Shelf which, as the gentleman from New York says, goes out beyond the traditional boundary. Putting this all in one package, I thought, was a good way to get at the problem, but it so happens that the other body did not see it that way. They elected to handle the matter in a two-package approach.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. This matter, it seems to me, is very much misunderstood. So far as title III is concerned, the bill under consideration now, it simply acknowledges that the Federal Government owns all the land in the so-called Continental Shelf, out from the historic boundary, and simply sets up the machinery whereby the Federal Government can administer the Continental Shelf.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the gentleman is correct, and I am glad he made that observation at this time. So far as I am concerned, my view is that the Federal Government should exercise that control and should have that domination beyond the historic boundaries.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman has stated that title III was contained in a bill as it passed the House. I would like to call his attention to the fact that the

language is identical with that contained in a bill passed in the last Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. I have not checked that carefully, but if the gentleman says it is identical, then for me that is enough, because I admire his capacity and his knowledge of the matters that come before us.

Now what are we trying to do? We simply are seeking to adjust to a parliamentary situation that which has developed between the two bodies of the Congress. And let me say for the record that I have been assured, and many of us have been assured, by the leadership in the other body that they will act on this title III and bring it to passage as a separate measure. If that is accomplished, then what is the difference so far as the end result is concerned between proceeding as we are or, perchance, sending this whole matter to conference?

Now, there are some practical considerations in connection with that, having regard to our desire to finally wind this up and get on with the other business of the Congress that I think should weigh with us. I will not undertake to go into detail now. I know there are a few Members of this body who are in opposition to the provisions of the bill this rule makes in order, but I dare say that the overwhelming majority of the Membership on both sides of the aisle is supporting this title III which has to do with the rights of the Federal Government in the Continental Shelf beyond the traditional boundaries of the States. So if I am correct in that, and I think I am, I dare say when this bill comes on for passage, if the roll should be called, or if there is a division vote, you will find at least 90 percent of the Membership supporting this legislation presently before us.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I understand the gentleman from Louisiana is against this bill, and some of his colleagues from Louisiana are against it, and there may be a few Members in some other States who are very vitally interested in titles I and II that may be a little unhappy about this title III, but just let me say to the gentleman, recognizing the realities, that this is about the way it has got to be if we are going to have legislation.

Mr. BOGGS. I should simply like to correct the record to point out that the bill passed in the last session of the Congress by the House of Representatives was not identical with title III, the bill that is before the House today. It provided for 37.5 percent participation by the States in the royalties, and also provided for the taxing and police authority.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman may be correct about that. We have had this bill before us so many times and there have been so many changes here and there that I must confess that on occasion I have lost sight of the details. However, if I recall, going back into the record, at one point the gentleman from Louisiana was contending for the traditional boundary, but I do not recall that he was contending so very vigorously for the area beyond the traditional boundary.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LANTAFF. To clarify our proceeding here this morning, will the bill for which the rule is now sought in any way conflict with the provisions of the bill enacted by the Senate pertaining to titles?

Mr. HALLECK. No, not at all, because it deals with a different matter. The bill as passed by the Senate, which is in large measure like titles I and II of our bill—there are some slight differences, but it is largely titles I and II of the bill we recently passed—deals with the traditional areas of the States. This bill deals with the areas beyond the traditional boundaries and so certainly could not be in conflict with the other legislation for which a rule has been granted and which we hope to take up today upon the adoption of the pending legislation.

Mr. LANTAFF. This bill is merely further amplification and sets up the machinery under which the Continental Shelf beyond the historical State boundaries is to be administered?

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I am sure the gentleman is not naive enough to believe that the Senate, which contains a great many so-called States' rights, will accept this so-called Graham bill, title III. If that is the case, do we not then destroy our bargaining power? If, under the usual, ordinary procedural developments, we went into conference, we would have that bargaining power. Now we destroy that bargaining power as far as the House is concerned.

Mr. HALLECK. I recognize the great capacity of the gentleman from New York. I am sure he recognizes with me that in matters before the Congress we shall certainly not suspect the integrity of the statements that are made by people in the Congress.

Just let me say this, and I think the gentleman from New York will agree with me, certainly the people on the other side who were against titles I and II are going to support title III. I have been assured, as I said before, by the responsible leadership in the other body that title III will be brought up and will be brought to enactment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman stated that those who had opposed the original tidelands bill should support the pending bill. Does the gentleman mean by that that in the event the tidelands bill as passed by the other body is declared unconstitutional, then this bill will apply not only to the Continental Shelf beyond the so-called historical State boundaries but to the land within the historical State boundaries as well?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course the gentleman is astute enough to know that it undertakes to assert the Federal rights beyond the traditional boundaries. If

what the gentleman contemplates the Supreme Court will do, but which I think it will not do, should result, then I would take it that the matter would be up for further consideration. But that is neither here nor there so far as the attitude of the folks is concerned who assert the right of the Federal Government to everything including the territorial boundaries. By what consistency could you justify being against this bill, which recognizes the rights of the Federal Government in the Continental Shelf, when you insist on the rights of the Federal Government from the very edge of the land boundary of the State out beyond the Continental Shelf?

I do not care to unduly prolong the consideration of this rule. Next, I thought I should make the statement I did in the interest of clarification of the situation, in the hope that we can get on with the consideration of both of these measures and bring them to final enactment today.

Mr. BOGGS. Further in the interest of clarification, I recall when the original bill was before the House, we had a title III which we amended with the so-called Keating amendment. Is this bill, H. R. 5134, identical with the title III that passed the House of Representatives?

Mr. HALLECK. It is. I do not claim to be an expert on all the details, but it is represented to me that it is.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I would like to make just one observation. It is identical with one exception, and that is it provides the Federal Government shall get the severance tax, which would otherwise go to the States.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Referring to the statement that the gentleman made about not wishing to unduly prolong this matter, my understanding is that the bill was only introduced yesterday afternoon at 1:30 p. m. They had a meeting of the committee outside here and not in the committee room. They reported it out. I do not know whether all members of the committee were notified at all. They got a rule at 2 o'clock and it is up here this morning. I do not think that is unduly prolonging this measure. Is that correct or not? That is what I want to ask the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I have explained all of that to the gentleman from Louisiana and everyone else who was interested. I well recall when we had this matter before us, you had lots of time to talk about title III.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I say to the gentleman that I simply asked him a question as to whether my statement was correct or not.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will wait just a moment, may I state I respect the gentleman and his ideas. I know what his idea is. I want the people of the State of Louisiana to know that he is violently opposed to title III.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to again go over what has transpired. I said at

the outset that this matter has been before us for years and years and years, and that we ought at some time come to the end with respect to it. The matter which is contained in this legislation was before the House of Representatives and was thoroughly debated and open to amendment and was passed. I would not assume that the committee would undertake to make any different judgment or that the House would make any different determination from what we did before. Under those circumstances, certainly, the gentleman should not complain of the action we have taken to let this matter come up for our consideration and come to a conclusion with respect to it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, my request to the last speaker to yield was for the purpose of explaining that the only difference in title III in H. R. 5134, upon which we are considering the rule, is that there is added a provision that in addition to all payments required under a lease, the lessee pays an additional royalty to the Federal Government equal to the amount of the severance tax charged by the abutting State. This applies only to an exchange of lease from the State to the Federal Government. This title III was considered previously in the House. I took the floor and urged the retention of title III because it is, in my opinion, extremely necessary, even though I was opposed to title I and title II of the same bill, which gave away the mineral resources of the United States situated within the historic State boundaries. I am for inclusion of title III in any submerged lands act. The reason I made the point of order which was overruled is because of the question of procedure. H. R. 5134 amends a non-existent act. The unusual hurried circumstances prompting the introduction of H. R. 5134 distress me. I hesitate to express the deep concern and feeling that is within me because of this unprecedented action. If the House concurs in the Senate amendments to H. R. 4198, the House will yield its bargaining power to include title 3 which is in H. R. 5134. I will vote to preserve title III. I will vote for H. R. 5134. I previously voted that title III apply within the historic boundaries of the States, that is, from the low-water mark seaward to the end of the Continental Shelf.

The important fact is when the amendment was made to strike out title 3, when we first considered this bill, the House by a vote of 103 to 12 voted to keep it in.

The House should insist on title III being included in any submerged-lands legislation. Our best assurance to that end would be to refuse to accept the Senate amendments to H. R. 4198, send it to conference and direct the conferees to insist on inclusion of title III. If we adopt title III in a separate bill, we will be giving the other body exactly what they want. We will lose any bargaining power that might be effective to persuade the other body to accept title III which was included in the original H. R. 4198 passed by the House.

Now we have this rule on H. R. 5134. It has come to us without title I and title II. I am against consideration at this time of this bill, H. R. 5134, because I want first to have this House consider the amendments in H. R. 4198 that were sent over from the Senate. I think they are an improvement, to some extent, over the House bill. However, they struck out entirely title III. Title III, as you know, gives the Federal Government complete control of the submerged lands seaward from the historic boundaries of the States. It is my opinion that we should not pass H. R. 5134 now, and we should refuse to accept the Senate amendments to H. R. 4198; send the latter bill to conference, then the Members of the House would have an opportunity to bargain with the Senate for the acceptance of title III.

I sincerely wish I could have the same feeling of assurance that the distinguished majority leader has, that the other body will accept H. R. 5134 when we pass it this afternoon. It is quite obvious that there are Members of this House who are strongly opposed to H. R. 5134. There is no question but that there are Members in the other body who are strongly opposed to H. R. 5134. It is quite obvious the reason is that they would like to give to the States adjoining these coastal waters a large and undeserved share of the royalties and revenues gained from the submerged land beyond the historic boundaries or the 3-mile limit; and in addition to that, to get for the States control of leasing, police powers, conservation powers and authority to assess severance taxes. So I feel that we should vote down this rule. Then reject the Senate amendments, and send the bill H. R. 4198 to conference and let this House work its will and try to get the Senate to agree to the contents of H. R. 5134 in its entirety. I am in favor of that. That is the reason why I think we should not put the cart before the horse. We are not giving the House an opportunity to bargain with the other body to put into effect H. R. 5134, which is the subject of this rule.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Assuming that your view should prevail, and you in effect kill title III, which apparently is what you are asking for, then the next rule is put on and we agree to the Senate bill on titles I and II. Then the gentleman has, in effect, brought about a situation by which he has denied Federal control of the Continental Shelf beyond the traditional boundary of the State; and, as I understand it, that is the last thing he wants.

Mr. FEIGHAN. That could be very well taken up again.

The SPEAKER. The title of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. It is of no essential importance that this bill be passed immediately. What you are trying to do is to give the other body an opportunity to reject entirely title III. If we yield, then we have got to start from scratch and

try to get title III, and we have no bargaining power with them.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Is it the gentleman's idea that we had far better let the bill that we passed and the Senate bill go to conference so that the matter may be considered in its entirety?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Absolutely. It could be done in one fell swoop. I assure you that in my opinion the House and the Nation would fare better.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, somebody has made up their mind that the better way to handle it is the way we are handling it now. As a Member of the House from your great State, you would not want to bring about a situation, believing as you do, that would handicap or interfere with the enactment of title III, recognizing, as you must recognize, that titles I and II are going to be enacted?

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is perfectly true, but assuming that this was turned down, it had its inception yesterday after 12 o'clock. If it were turned down it could again have its inception this afternoon and probably be brought up on the floor again tomorrow. I think the gentleman's argument is untenable.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. That just indicates, of course, the strength of what I argued earlier. Maybe the gentleman himself is not kind of tired of this whole matter, but I happen to be; and I just do not want to go into any kind of procedure that is going to keep this matter interminably before us. I sincerely hope that what we do today will mark the end of our action on this subject.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I do not believe the gentleman is so tired that he like myself and many other Members does not want to bring to fruition the ability of the Federal Government to authorize explorations and drillings in the Continental Shelf beyond the 3-mile limit or the historic boundaries, which are so necessary for our national defense, and the revenues which will inure to the Federal Government.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take any time on this rule because I thought it was quite apparent that the rule was going to be adopted and that we could get along with this legislation, but there has been so much fuss raised around here, confusion or attempted confusion, that I just want to make one or two observations.

First, I quite agree with the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], that the opposition to this bill H. R. 5134 by their efforts would seem to defeat the very end they really have in mind. They will all tell you that they favor H. R. 5134, but they want to do it a different way.

Let us just face the situation. What does H. R. 5134 do? It gives the United States Government the rights to the so-

called Continental Shelf. What is the situation now with reference to that? That is all in confusion. You will not have the production of these so-called trillions of dollars worth of oil that supposedly lies out there. Nobody knows about that. You know we hear a lot about this big giveaway of trillions of dollars; nobody knows what there is there. But you cannot explore it and you cannot produce it now because the oil contractors, the producers, do not know where they are. They cannot risk their money by going in and dealing with the States because they do not know whether the States have title; and the same thing applies to the Federal Government. So you have an impasse with no leasing, no exploration, and no oil production.

The so-called States Righters—and I confess that I belong to that group, the old Jeffersonian group who believe in States' rights as opposed to the Hamiltonian group who believe in a strong central government with everything concentrated in the Federal Government—I am proud to belong to the Jeffersonian group, and sometimes I wonder about some of my so-called liberal friends who have deserted the Jeffersonian principles and gone over and embraced the Hamiltonian principles. Yet in spite of the fact that this legislation would give them what they want they oppose it. Why? Only to confuse the issue. If you will just bear with me for one minute I will tell you what this is all about. The real situation has been hinted at here this morning, but no one has just been frank enough to say it in plain language. It would be better, of course, to have this all in one package, to have one bill.

But why do we not have it in one bill? The answer is obvious. No one knows better than our so-called liberal friends, who are complaining here today about the manner in which this legislation is being handled, that if they could succeed in sending this legislation to conference, further action would be required on the conference report in the other Chamber as well as in this body. While the conference report would undoubtedly be speedily acted upon in this body, they also realize that when it got over to the Senate it would face an extended filibuster—I am sorry, filibuster is not the word. Our liberal friends do not use the word filibuster when they resort to that technique in the Senate. That is a reprehensible term which must be hurled at States' righters, and particularly, a stigma to be applied only to that group of Senators from the Deep South. It will be recalled that when this legislation was up for consideration in the other body, the so-called liberal opponents carried on a rather lengthy debate lasting several weeks. In that debate everything from the Ten Commandments to atomic energy was discussed. Of course, this was not a filibuster. It was just full and lengthy debate. But, may I remind my friends that had that full and lengthy debate been sponsored by the Southern Members of that body on, shall I say, the so-called civil-rights legislation, it would have been designated as a filibuster.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, since that is the strategy of the opponents of this

whole subject of tidelands legislation, that is what they set out to accomplish—send the bill to conference where it could be talked to death with another full and extended debate in the other body. That is obvious to every Member on this floor. So why not say it forthrightly and be through with it.

Mr. Speaker, as has been well pointed out here, somewhere along the line there has got to be an end to legislation. This matter has been kicking around here ever since I have been in Congress, and I have been here a pretty good while, some two decades. We have got to have a settlement of it, and this is the practical way to settle it. When the rule is adopted, title III will be passed eventually, as it is bound to be, because, certainly, my liberal friends cannot vote against it, my Hamiltonian friends cannot vote against it because it is what they want. Then if we pass the other resolution which is to follow this, adopting the Senate amendments and sending it down to the other end of the Avenue where no doubt it will be signed, that is the end. Then the question of whether the Hamiltonian principles so far as the right to the Continental Shelf is concerned, and I subscribe to that, will be up to the other body. But it is up to us to discharge our duty here today.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The question I have in mind is what assurance do we have that the Senate will now accept title III as embodied in H. R. 5134 which the Senate refused to accept in the bill that we adopted in the House and which it has turned down? I cannot reconcile that statement.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. When the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is read it will be found that a promise was made in the other body that if title III was knocked out of the bill there they would take this up in the Senate within 2 weeks.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That does not answer the question.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, this body cannot give assurances as to what the other body will do. But, we will have discharged our duty, as I said a moment ago.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman says that they will take it up in 2 weeks. But, they have turned it down in one bill. I have read the report, and it seems to me that they are complicating the process, and it seems to me the logical thing to do is refuse to accept the Senate amendments to the bill we passed first and then go to conference.

Mr. COLMER. If my good friend was listening to what I was saying a moment ago, I think he will understand why it is being handled this way.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was listening. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to make some reference to this States' rights matter. I want to tell the Members of this House that I believe in States rights, too. I voted against the tidelands bill because I felt

I would be surrendering some of my State's rights. I think the people who are talking about States' rights are criticizing some of us who are States' righters because of the position we have taken on it, but I still say that the best way to handle this matter would be to go to conference and not go through this unusual procedure of bringing a bill in here. I admit we would all like to see title III adopted, but this is an unusual way to do it. In spite of the fact that I have been listening, regardless of what the gentleman has said about that, I am still not convinced that this is being handled in the proper way or in an orderly way.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know whether the gentleman from Missouri heard my statement or not.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I have been on the floor the entire time.

Mr. HALLECK. Well then, I do not know whether it would avail anything for me to again state the basis upon which I approach this matter. I will say, however, again, that I have had assurances from the responsible leadership in the other body that this matter will be brought on for action. So far as I am concerned, I accept those assurances. I would also certainly be very sure, although I have no assurances about it, that many of the people who were in opposition to titles 1 and 2 will, when this title 3 comes over there, support the measure. That would mean to me an overwhelming support of this legislation when it comes to the other body.

Let me say just one further thing. The gentleman says since they did not include title III in their bill, that that means there is some intimation that they will not consider title III. May I say to the gentleman, without disclosing confidences with respect to meetings where we discussed this whole matter, that from the beginning the leadership in the other body has felt that this ought to be handled in a two-package arrangement. That did not make any difference to me except I thought we might handle it in one package. But certainly the fact that the other body decided that they would handle it in two packages ought to be assurance that they will take up the second package rather than not take it up.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Would it not be far simpler to settle this matter in conference rather than to go through the procedure of passing a bill and the other side passing a bill?

Mr. HALLECK. I hope the gentleman will not press me too far on that, because I have the highest respect for the so-called upper body, and I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for making a few blunt statements that a lot of people recognize. I said at the outset and I say it again, this is as good a way to get at it as any. It will all come out all right. Let us go ahead and adopt these two rules and take this action, and let us all be consistent. If you are against titles I and II you will get a chance to vote against them again. If you are for title III, you can vote for it now.

Mr. COLMER. I want to add this statement: I certainly do not want my friend from Missouri to get the idea that he seems to have gotten that I thought he was not attentive to this business. He is always most attentive. He is always most alert and on the job. I merely wanted to know whether or not I was getting my idea across. I guess it was my failure to successfully explain the matter that caused his remarks. He is usually sound; I am sorry that he does not agree with me on this matter. But that is his right. I entertain a very high regard for him.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5134, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks, I would like to give a brief review of my part in this legislation over the last 8 years. My attention was first called to it by the attorney general of the State of Pennsylvania and the Governor of Pennsylvania writing to me in the year 1945 and asking me as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary to pay particular attention to the legislation which had been proposed. As I recall it, at that time 47 governors of States petitioned together with 44 attorneys general in the matter. Hardly any measure could have received more unanimous support than that, if I am correct in my recollection of the figures. Forty-seven governors of the great sovereign States of this Union joined in this matter along with 44 attorneys general. In the years that intervened the matter has been brought before us, and I, in my personal capacity, have served as a conferee, I believe, three times in conferences between the House of Representa-

tives and the other body. The man, who in my judgment deserves the greatest credit in this matter, is the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER, a Member on the Democratic side. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] introduced this bill, followed it through, and has given it his close personal attention throughout the years. By the changes of political fortunes, I now occupy the place that he held during the years in which our Democratic friends were in control. A year ago, when we went to conference, the bill contained three titles. The only difference between our third title today is this—that then it provided for a 37½-percent tax and also, I think, that the State should have the severance tax. We sat with Members of the other body, if I am correct in my recollection, for 3 or 4 days trying to reach an adjustment in the matter. When we failed, we relinquished our contention for the 37½ percent and other matters and returned. If you will cudgel your minds by way of refreshing your memory, you will recall the House passed this bill, but it was not passed by the other body in the form that we submitted it. So much, Mr. Chairman, for the background of the bill.

Now as for the present bill, you will recall President Eisenhower made a campaign pledge that he would seek to see that the so-called tidelands, which is a misnomer, it really should be called the submerged oil lands, would release oil to the separate States. In fulfillment of that promise, I was called to the White House for a conference on this matter, and it was decided I would introduce the bill again. My original thought was to introduce it in the form in which we had it last year, that is, with two titles. Title I, giving the definitions; and title II, assuring to the States their rights and powers, particularly the inland States, having reference to the Great Lakes. We began a series of hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary. We called before us the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Brownell. We called before us Mr. McKay, the Secretary of the Interior, and a representative of the Navy Department. After those men, in their several capacities, had testified, they were in accord that the bill should contain 3 titles, and asked me to withdraw the original bill containing 2 titles, and submit a third bill containing 3 titles. In conformity with their wishes, we did that. The subcommittee reported the bill to the full committee, and after some discussion in the full committee it was reported favorably to the House. We began debate on the 30th day of March and continued throughout that day and the succeeding day, March 31. We could have voted on that day, but it so happened it was a Jewish holiday and a request was made that we carry the vote over until the morning of April 1. On that morning we voted by a vote of 285 to 158, the bill containing all three titles: Title I, title II, and title III, and the bill was sent to the other body. They began their debate on that day. They finished that debate, so-called, on the 7th day of May. In other words, what we had done in this House in 2½ days required nearly 7

weeks for them to accomplish. What they did is a matter of history.

As to the manner in which this is brought here, the Senate returned the bill, you might say disassociating title III. We have before us titles I and II in the bill.

Here again I want to digress for a moment and pay tribute to the leadership of this House, both on the Republican side and on the Democratic side. I am frank to say to you that I have consulted with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], our majority leader, and I consulted with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the minority leader. I have great respect, outstanding respect, for those two men. The mere fact that they are on different sides of the aisle means nothing to me. In my judgment, they are two of the outstanding Americans, and I pay tribute and homage to them at all times.

When those two gentlemen heard this story, they in turn got together in a conference of minds—and I make no disparaging reference to those who criticize and ask why these things are done—mine is to accept the responsibility given me by the leadership, and I follow that leadership. I followed the leadership of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and brought this bill before the House.

There was some rapid work done. There is no concealment about that. There were certain interests which had to be considered. I do not desire to disclose those private matters, but they who proposed these had good and sufficient reasons. There was no undue haste. Their desire was that this be done decently and in order and effectively, and for once and all put behind us, and get on to the other problems that confront this Nation in the days that lie ahead. We have spent too much time on it. We have wasted too much time on it. Every issue is distinctly understood. There is not a man in this House or in the other body or the great public press that does not know the background of this.

We decided, as you know, the territorial limits, the historic boundaries extending 3 miles out; and, due to the foresight and great judgment of those who created the Republic of Texas, they took care of themselves to 10½ miles. In that connection, after we had taken care of that we then decided in title 3 that the Continental Shelf that extends out from 90 to 120 miles should become the property of the Federal Government, and that comprises 90 percent of all the area in which oil can be drilled for. Ten percent remains within the confines of the original State historic boundaries.

You must realize that this outer Continental Shelf is the area where it is most costly to drill, some of the wells costing many millions of dollars. Regular little colonies are built up around these wells out to sea. The matter of police protection enters into it, and the whole thing becomes a matter of vital importance.

Mr. Chairman, the problem is to differentiate and divide between States rights and the rights of the Federal Government, and to the best of our ability we sought to do it. There has been no chicanery, no trickery, no quick action

in this in the sense of putting anything over on anybody. We have attempted to deal justly and honestly with the States and with the Federal Government.

Now as to the outcome the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has assured you, and so has the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]—I repeat these honorable men have said they have assurances—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. What does this new bill do in contrast with the old? And I hope you will indulge me for a moment, because it is highly technical, and I would like to read from our report.

The first thing that we say is that this new bill is to amend the submerged lands act in the area of the outer Continental Shelf, beyond the boundaries of the shelf may be leased and developed by the Federal Government. That puts 90 percent of that land under the control and direction of the Federal Government. I know it is a great hardship to the States of Texas and Louisiana; they will suffer terribly in the matter of their taxation, but in the light of dealing with all the 48 States of the Union, in the light of dealing with Alaska, and if Hawaii should come in as a State, of dealing with Hawaii, we must take the whole composite picture and deal with it as an entirety and with the sovereignty of the whole United States.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I want to pay tribute to that group—no, I do not yield to the gentleman at all.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GRAHAM. I refuse to yield; you may get it on your own time—and I do not know of a better illustration of an attempted filibuster than what we see here today.

Now, what is the next thing? Four changes are made in certain sections of the bill and here I would like to read from the report:

Section 1 of the bill, H. R. 5134, amends section 2 of the Submerged Lands Act by adding thereto four new paragraphs. Subsection (1) defines the term "outer Continental Shelf" as those submerged lands which lie outside of seaward of lands beneath navigable waters as defined in section 2 of that act, and of which the subsoil and natural resources appertain to the United States. The term "Secretary" is defined as the Secretary of the Interior. The term "lease" is also defined, as is also the term "Mineral Leasing Act."

The above terms are added to section 2 of the Submerged Lands Act since they refer exclusively to the area in the outer Continental Shelf beyond State boundaries.

Section 2 of the bill further amends the Submerged Lands Act by striking out therefrom sections 9, 10, and 11. Section 9 of the Submerged Lands Act constitutes a legislative confirmation of jurisdiction over the natural resources of the seabed and subsoil of the Continental Shelf seaward of the original State boundaries, which was asserted in the Presidential proclamation of 1945. The need for this section is obviated by the addition of title III which deals specifically

with the same area, particularly with regard to the new matter set forth in section 9 (a) of the bill, H. R. 5134. Section 10 of the Submerged Lands Act is also made unnecessary by the new matter being added to the act as specifically contained in section 19.

The provisions of section 11 which are stricken from the Submerged Lands Act by this bill are exactly the same as contained in section 21 of H. R. 5134. In this regard the bill merely transposes the section from one title to another title and is a clarifying amendment to that extent.

Title III relates solely to the outer Continental Shelf outside of State boundaries.

Section 9 (a) constitutes a legislative confirmation of the jurisdiction of the United States over the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf outside State boundaries. It makes applicable to that area Federal laws and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to administer the provisions of this title and to adopt such rules and regulations as are not inconsistent with Federal laws to apply therein.

Those are the changes from the original title III which passed the House on April 1 of this year. When the bill is being read for amendment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] will offer an amendment that will take care of several things that have developed in the interim. With that we feel that we are passing now an act that the whole public of the United States may understand. They may now learn who are the real friends of the State, they will know who is seeking to protect the interests of the United States and, to inject a little politics into this, they will realize that the President has complied with his word when we pass this bill, and if the other body will pass it, and if we adopt the other rule, a great campaign pledge will have been confirmed to the people of the United States.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, time will not permit a discussion of all the provisions of the bill now before us. I will limit my remarks to section 9.

This bill was introduced yesterday. Within a matter of minutes after its introduction a special meeting of the Judiciary Committee was called in the Capitol and not in the regular quarters of the committee. Only about two-thirds of the members were able to attend the meeting. The bill was not referred to a subcommittee in usual order of business, and of course no hearings of any kind were conducted.

The language in section 9 definitely was not contained in any bill previously introduced in the House or in the Senate. The language contained in this section was never considered by any committee of Congress. The language contained in this section was never before recommended by any committee of Congress. This language was adopted on the floor of the House recently when we considered the bill, H. R. 4198, and after exactly 20 minutes of debate. When that occurred I moved to strike out title III to the end that we might study the matter,

but my motion did not prevail. I was against the provisions of the section then, and I am unalterably opposed to them now.

Here is some of the new language appearing on page 3, line 1:

Federal laws now in effect or hereafter adopted shall apply to the entire area of the Continental Shelf.

Here we find one of the bugs under the chip. This is a brand new approach to the problem. I repeat that this approach was never before contained in any bill introduced in Congress. It was never considered by any committee of Congress.

Heretofore the bills provided that to begin with, the laws and police power of the States would apply, until such time at least as Congress and committees of Congress studied the question of the adequacy and applicability of Federal laws to the Continental Shelf. We proceeded along that line because we realized that Federal laws as presently written are utterly inadequate to cover this field.

Of course, the succeeding paragraph of the section goes on to say:

Except to the extent that they are inconsistent with applicable Federal laws now in effect or hereafter enacted, or such regulations as the Secretary may adopt, the laws of each coastal State which so provides shall be applicable—

And so forth. The quoted provision is also a new approach. What is the practical significance of this language?

First, the States probably would have to call their legislatures into special session to extend their laws to cover the Continental Shelf.

Second, after going through this trouble and expense, it could be argued that the Secretary of the Interior could whimsically by regulation modify or nullify such State laws.

Are you, and especially those of you who believe in States rights, willing to give the Secretary of the Interior the power to repeal your State laws?

We too frequently give a bureaucrat the power to adopt regulations to carry out the provisions of a law, but never before have we given him power to supercede a law. The unsoundness of this whole approach is exceeded only by its unconstitutionality.

It could be argued that you may as well forget about the application of State laws and police power. They apparently do not intend them to apply anyway, because the first premise is that—

Federal laws now in effect or hereafter adopted shall apply to the entire area of the Continental Shelf.

The fundamental question before us is, are Federal laws as presently written adequate to cover the conduct of men and the development of the mineral resources underlying the subsoil of the Continental Shelf? I submit that the answer is no. Let me give you a few illustrations.

There are no Federal conservation laws on the books specifically applicable to the Continental Shelf. Some Members may contend that the Secretary of the Interior might devise appropriate regulations or might adopt applicable State conservation laws. The answer is that he might or might not, depending

on how he feels about it. The principle of separation of powers is the bedrock of our republican form of government. We in this body represent the legislative branch of the Government, and we should never abdicate our functions with our eyes wide open. I simply will not vote to make a czar out of a bureaucrat.

Since human beings will be involved in the operations on the Continental Shelf, we must assume that crimes will be committed, torts will occur, disputes will arise between labor and management, workmen will be injured, and contracts will be made and will require enforcement.

When a tort is committed because of someone's negligence, in what forum will redress be available? As lawyers we know that every act whatever of man that causes damage to another obliges him by whose fault it happened to repair it. Where and how would such a fault occurring in operations on the Continental Shelf be repaired? I have heard it rumored since yesterday that the Jones Act might afford relief. I personally dispute that idea, because the Jones Act deals with seamen. Laborers on drilling rigs or platforms in the sea are not seamen or maritime workers.

When a workman is injured in the course and scope of his employment, how and in what court of the United States can he expect compensation for his injuries? We certainly cannot look to the Federal Employers' Liability Act, because this statute applies only to employees of the United States. The laborers with whom we are concerned will be on the payroll of private industry.

Nor can we find relief under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, because that law does not seem to have anything to do with the problem.

And what about the myriad situations which will arise under contractual arrangements? Suppose a contract which involves less than \$3,000 entered into between citizens of the same State is violated. How and where will it be enforced? Certainly the aggrieved party could not file suit in the courts of the United States, because there would be no diversity of citizenship and the jurisdictional amount of \$3,000 would be lacking.

No one can seriously deny that Federal courts have no general jurisdiction over common-law crimes and misdemeanors. The criminal jurisdiction of the Federal courts is limited to crimes defined by Federal law within a limited area.

Nor can anyone pretend that the body of maritime law, dealing, as it does, with vessels and seamen, is sufficient and adequate to cover the torts, crimes and misdemeanors, disputes, labor and management arrangements, injuries to workmen, contractual relationships, and other situations which will inevitably arise in connection with the geophysical explorations and mineral development of the submerged lands in the Continental Shelf outside of and beyond State boundaries.

Mr. Chairman, it must be recognized that this bill constitutes a radical departure from legislation heretofore adopted by this body and dealing spe-

cifically with the Continental Shelf. Under the provisions of the Walter bill, State laws and police power were made to apply in the area of the Continental Shelf. This feature seems to have been effectively removed. Under the Walter bill, the States received 37½ percent of the returns. This provision has been eliminated. Under the Walter bill, the States were given taxing powers. These powers are now completely denied to the States. The simple fact is the political and economic rights of the States have been almost completely ignored. It can be argued that the Federal Government gets everything. The States get nothing, period.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Those questions the gentleman has raised were propounded to the Committee on the Judiciary yesterday, and there was no argument whatsoever to it; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIS. Well, I did not get any answer to the argument I am now making.

As I have indicated, we lawyers know that every act whatever of man that causes damage to another obliges him by whose fault it happened to repair it. That is a substantial definition of a tort. Now, if a tort occurs in that area, how is it going to be repaired? Before what court are you going to proceed? What Federal law is there to cover the subject?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to answer the gentleman's question. I think it is abundantly clear that it is our intention that the laws of torts in the several States shall be applicable in this territory. I am sure we have done that through this language.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman read the language?

Mr. WALTER. It reads, "The laws of each coastal State which so provide shall be applicable to that portion of the outer Continental Shelf," and so on.

Mr. WILLIS. "The laws of each coastal State which so provide." Up to now the coastal States have not so provided.

Mr. WALTER. But the gentleman is overlooking this fact, that what this language does and the effect of this language is to make applicable to this territory beyond historical boundaries those rules of law in the several States which would be applicable if the boundaries of the States extended on out beyond the historical boundaries.

Mr. WILLIS. As the gentleman knows, I have every respect for his opinion, but I submit that I have read that sentence very carefully. It states, "The laws of the coastal States which so provide." Louisiana has never provided for an extraterritorial effect of its laws to the Continental Shelf. Texas has not, nor so far as I know has California or any other State. So for the time being the Federal laws are definitely going to apply.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. To clarify that point, is it not a fact that at the present time the Louisiana State line goes out 27 miles? In other words, in part of this Continental Shelf area do not the State laws now apply?

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman, of course, refers to the act of the Legislature of Louisiana extending our boundaries out 27 miles. Assuming that act to be valid, the point I make would still remain, because the Continental Shelf stretches out as far as 125 miles.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS].

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. I know it is going to be approved by an overwhelming majority of the Members of this body. I have no new matter I can add to the long and extensive debates which have taken place on this legislation. I feel that the committee is thoroughly familiar with the basic facts involved.

I merely wish to comment with reference to my distinguished chairman of the Judiciary subcommittee who has so skillfully handled this legislation not only this year but in previous years, and who is the author of the bill now before us, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]. It has been a distinct pleasure to serve under his chairmanship on this important subcommittee. I believe this committee and this body owe him a great debt of gratitude for the attention and devotion he has given to what is an extremely important piece of legislation. I also wish to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] for his excellent contribution to the preparation and passage of this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have become a little confused on this issue because of the statement made by the gentleman from Louisiana. He is opposed to section 9. Does the gentleman know if the opposition of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] to section 9 will prevent him from supporting the balance of the bill?

Mr. HILLINGS. It is my understanding from debate previously that the gentleman from Louisiana and his colleagues from that State will oppose the bill, but I think it would be more proper to direct the question to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] just stepped off the floor and will be back in a moment, and I shall not attempt to answer for him; but I can say that section 9 is the heart of the whole bill. When you take from the State the authority to make any reference to the taxation out there in the Continental Shelf for the purpose of paying the cost of the enforcement of the laws, you bring in an entirely new doctrine which to my mind is most unsavory. I just would not

support it and I do not intend to. I do not know what may be the views of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. GRAHAM. Has the gentleman overlooked the case decided in the Supreme Court of *Toom v. Witzel* (334 U. S. 385) where concurrent jurisdiction is recognized?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I have not overlooked it. I do not intend to argue the legality of the question, but I do intend to argue the advisability from a constitutional viewpoint of adopting this approach to the handling of these lands beyond the historic boundaries of the States.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, unless this section is changed, the gentleman then would oppose the entire bill?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes, I will oppose the bill, I mean—the last bill which was introduced yesterday at 1:30 p. m. and reported to the Committee on Rules at 2 o'clock, and which has been brought here today. I will oppose that bill unless the provisions of section 9 are changed or modified very greatly. That is my intention.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am just seeking information, of course.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I have profound respect for the gentleman and his ability as an agricultural leader, and I have followed him on many occasions. If the gentleman will accord me some little modicum of ability with reference to oil and gas matters, perhaps the gentleman would be encouraged to follow me in a case like this.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I might be willing, and I am seeking information. Since the State of Louisiana is one of the beneficiaries, and rightfully so of this act, I want to lift a little confusion from my mind about the opposition.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I rather think the State of Louisiana has more at stake than any other State in the Union with reference to the proper handling of this property and the determination of this matter. Naturally, we are keenly sensitive as to how these things are handled.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman intend to offer an amendment as to section 9?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I cannot go that far, but I can tell you this—that I would welcome an amendment, if the gentleman will offer amendments which are contained in the Walter bill, and I will support him on it and speak in behalf of them and vote with him on them.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am very happy that the gentleman has supported me on so many agricultural questions, but I do not think I am in a position to draft an amendment which would satisfy the criticisms which have been raised by you and your colleagues.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS] has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this bill. I am going to vote against the next bill, and for the following reasons. I am not going to vote to

help pay the political debt of the Republican Party and President Eisenhower to Governor Shivers of Texas. That is the nub of my real opposition. What is the situation now?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This issue was before the House prior to the election of last year. Did the gentleman take the same position at that time?

Mr. CELLER. I certainly did take the same position. My position is that the Federal Government has dominion and control over the offshore minerals. There is no deviation whatsoever from it. Let me please go on, and then I shall be glad to yield. It would be the height of naivete to think that the other body is going to accept this bill, which we undoubtedly will adopt today. The so-called States' righters from California, Texas, Louisiana, and other States will not accept this bill which says that the Federal Government shall have dominion, imperium, possession, and the right to lease all the lands seaward from the traditional State borders. They will be unalterably against this bill when it goes to the other chamber. Then what will you have? You will only have the adoption of the so-called title 1 and title 2, which is in the next bill which will be adopted by this House, and since it was adopted by the other body will become the law of the land. You will only have what? The States will have all the minerals offshore to the so-called traditional State boundaries. What about title III? The so-called States righters reason this way: By this maneuver, by this rather clever, rather skillful, and adroit maneuver, they will get half a loaf, and later on they will start a campaign all over for title III. They will have the lands seaward from low-water mark outward to State boundaries. Then the wheels of propaganda will be started to get the balance for the States, for example, the Continental Shelf beyond the State boundaries.

They get what they want. We are left holding the bag. The Federal Government has the cards stacked against it. The Federal Government will be eulchred out of all interest. If the regular procedure had been followed and the bill had been referred to conference, this whole matter could have been ironed out. There could have been quid pro quo, consideration for consideration, and something could have been worked out. We who fight to retain as lessor the shelf for the Federal Government will have no bargaining power whatsoever. In whose fertile brain was this scheme hatched? I would like to know that. It has not been answered. This is very unusual procedure. Members of the Judiciary Committee were hastily summoned, with practically no notice, and asked to swallow this scheme, hook, line, and sinker. Well, I am against it. In principle I like this bill, but I am going to vote to indicate my emphatic unmitigated protest against the procedure that is being adopted here this afternoon.

I know, just as well as day follows night and night follows the day, that when we pass the next bill—which will

become the law of the land—this instant bill will not become the law of the land. Then the excitement will start all over again in Texas and Louisiana and California and elsewhere, to the end that the States may be permitted to grab all this black gold that may exist offshore, seaward from the traditional State boundaries to the edge of the Shelf. And then what? This is only the beginning.

This is the season for plunder. This is the season for easy pickings. All the public domain will be offered on the auction block. All of our wildlife reserves, all of our national parks will be put under the hammer. Efforts have already been inaugurated to do that very thing. Do you know, it has gone so far that in my own State of New York a legislator had the temerity to rise in his place and say that Government-owned West Point with its very valuable land on the Hudson, the site and all Military Academy buildings, should be sold to a prep school for \$20 million. I can cite you other examples by enthusiastic, misguided State legislators and others who are seeking to sell, and as I said before, place on the auction block a great deal of our public domain and our public lands. I repeat, this is but the first step in transferring all of our entire nationally owned resources to the States. This is indeed the season for plunder. Our parks, our forests, our minerals—are these to follow in the wake of offshore oil? Is the much abused shibboleth of States rights to be utilized as a convenient device to take from the people of the United States their complete natural resources for private exploitation?

The sustained-yield capacity of the national forests alone is 10 million boardfeet, according to the estimates of the Forest Service. According to the recent Paley Commission report:

A large portion of the mineral deposits yet to be discovered in this country are located in lands in the Western States still belonging to the Federal Government.

Bills have been introduced, Mr. Chairman; bills have been offered in the other body, to the effect that the mineral deposits under the federally owned lands in certain States belong to the States. In Wyoming the Federal Treasury has received out of the Federal-controlled mineral-deposit lands about \$135 million in royalties. This has gone into the United States Treasury. Now one of the distinguished Senators from that State says that all future money belongs to Wyoming; or, rather, I would say that all future royalties that come from that submerged oil in the State of Wyoming shall belong to the State of Wyoming. And there is a mighty good reason behind what the distinguished Senator from Wyoming agitates for; for example, we say here without the quiver of an eyelash that the mineral deposits offshore, off the shores of California, Louisiana, and Texas belong to the States. It is a stronger argument to say that the deposits underneath the particular State shall belong to that State. If we pass this bill we open the door to a plethora of other bills to the same effect. Do not think I am talking a lot of "malarkey" here. Just see what the

opening gun in this plunder campaign is: The opening gun, for example, to weaken our Forest Service; and that gun was fired by Lawrence F. Lee, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce in a speech before the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association. He said the following:

A study be made by Congress, by departments, of the Federal real estate inventory to the end that all property which, in the public interest, is best adapted to private ownership be offered for sale as soon as possible and thus placed on the tax rolls and in the productive use of private enterprise."

There you have it. His plan is simple. Congress, after completion of the study, would prepare legislation to sell all of Uncle Sam's real estate, except that not adapted for private use.

As of the present time, the Federal Government owns from 35 to 45 percent of all lands in the States of Washington, Montana, Colorado, and New Mexico; 45 to 55 percent of all land in California, Oregon, and Wyoming; 65 to 75 percent of the land in Idaho, Utah, and Arizona, and 85 percent of all land in Nevada. Is the present bill to constitute precedent for the abdication of all Federal areas and their rich resources? Is all to go under the hammer?

This is not a mere figment of our imagination. Already, I repeat, rumblings can be heard. Proponents in the Senate have already suggested that along with submerged lands, other national areas belonging to the people be given away. Only last year, the report of the Paley Commission emphasized the need for conservation of our vital raw materials, our forests, and our mineral wealth. We do not believe that these resources presently owned and controlled by the national Government in trust for all of the people should be disposed of purely for the purpose of private exploitation. We feel that we must express this view vigorously for we do not feel that Members of this body were elected to preside at the dissolution of the national domain.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. Is it not true that the argument the gentleman is advancing at this time does not actually apply to this bill? This bill actually establishes Federal ownership and does not do any of the things the gentleman is talking about. This bill would confirm and establish Federal ownership in the area of the Continental Shelf beyond the historical State boundaries.

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman were listening or harkening unto what I said he would realize that I said this bill, and the passage of this bill, is only a gesture, as far as this House is concerned; it will not receive the approval of the other body; it cannot receive the approval of the other body. I am not a Cassandra; I do not read tea leaves, but I know that 2 and 2 make 4. I have read the debates in the other body on the main bill. The so-called States Righters themselves who were for title 1 and title 2 are not going to swallow title 3. We would be left holding the bag; the Federal Govern-

ment would be euchred out of title 3; and then, as I said, the campaign will start all over again, and the agitation, the ceaseless agitation in certain States to have the States lay their hands upon the offshore oil deposits seaward of the traditional State boundaries would begin all over again.

Mr. HILLINGS. I would like to ask the gentleman one more question if he will yield.

Mr. CELLER. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. HILLINGS. In his earlier remarks the gentleman stated that this legislation was brought before this committee primarily because of campaign pledges or promises made by the President. Is it not true that when the so-called tidelands legislation passed this body this year and in previous years a majority, Democrats as well as a majority of Republicans, supported the bill? Is it not true that in this instance the majority leadership, as well as the minority leadership, is currently supporting this legislation?

Mr. CELLER. I think the gentleman is a little bit disingenuous in that statement. He will forgive me for saying that. I have been here long enough to know that legislation just does not develop as the gentleman would wish to have it develop. It is just a little bit of wishful thinking on his part in that regard. Certain minds came together here and we have a situation such as this. I say it is a very dangerous situation to legislate this way. We should have gone to conference on the general bill. The minute you depart from the usual procedures you always have this difficulty. That is the gravamen of my complaint.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to elaborate a little bit upon my answers to some questions which were propounded of me a while ago by a colleague in the House of Representatives. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] spoke in opposition to section 9 of this bill, which I think is the heart of the bill. If this section were modified in conformity with the provisions of the Walter bill, if it were modified in the direction of his bill, it would be far more palatable to the people of the State of Louisiana.

My objection is based on the background and the whole theory of this operation. It is proposed in this bill that was introduced yesterday afternoon at 1:30, adopted by the committee and a rule obtained by 2 o'clock, then brought up here today, that the Secretary shall reimburse the abutting States in the amount of the reasonable cost of administration of the laws. That means simply that the Secretary of the Interior will call in a State and say: "Now, we want your laws, we like them, we want them enforced here in the area off the coast of your State. What can you do the job for?"

Then there will be a proposition of bargaining back and forth. The State will want the revenue from the contract entered into to enforce the laws. They will bargain and finally arrive at some

arrangement whereby under a bargaining contract the State will be employed as an agency of the United States to enforce the laws in the offshore areas beyond State boundaries. Theoretically I think that is bad. I am one who believes in States rights, but I think the last vestige of States rights is apt to be forgotten when we begin to bargain that way with the sovereign States of our Nation. The States are going to want to get as much money as they can for the enforcement of the laws and the Federal Government is going to want to do it as cheaply as possible. The States will be employed as you would employ a gardener, bricklayer, or painter to do this job of enforcing the laws insofar as we want them enforced.

Now that is a very serious thing because the laws to be enforced will most probably be, first of all, the criminal laws. In the State of Louisiana, for instance, just a few miles out beyond the historic boundary line, they will be spending four or five million dollars to drill a deep oil well, maybe 10,000 feet down. There may be a criminal offense committed out there, perhaps murder or some other serious criminal offense. Then the State will step in to enforce its State laws against murder under the contract which it has negotiated with the Federal Government to handle that job. The Federal Government does not like the severity which the State government exercises in the enforcement of the laws and then at the end of the term of the contract the Government may say, "Well, we do not like the way in which you are applying these laws, they are not severe enough" or "they are too severe" and then the Government will say, "We will not employ you again on that job and we will not give you the money you are entitled to receive."

I think the theory behind the whole thing is bad. I think it has a direct tendency to undermine all vestige of States rights in the coastal States.

In addition to that I would say this, that our laws expressly provide in many instances that they will have no extraterritorial effect. We have a provision in the code of the State of Louisiana that laws do not have extraterritorial effect. What arrangements are we going to make, for instance, outside of a bargaining contract, to school these children of the workers who drill these wells off the coast of the State of Louisiana? The time may come when there might be as many as 10,000 workers with 30,000 children, or something of that sort, and we will have to provide schooling facilities for those people. The time may come when we will have to provide special laws covering torts, as my colleague has already indicated, for those things that are done in violation of a law beyond the 3-mile limit.

Of course, the conservation laws of the State of Louisiana could, by contract, be extended out 100 miles, or as far out as the Continental Shelf goes, as well as the fishing laws, and the laws covering compensation, and the laws covering contracts and all those things which now have no extraterritorial effect. Perhaps under the laws of the State of Louisiana provision would have to be made by the State Legislature to take care of that.

So, I say specifically I think the theory is wrong. If you want to do the job, if you want the States to enforce those laws beyond the area owned by the State, beyond the area over which they have dominion, I think the way to do it is by permitting some measure of taxation rights, and perhaps a certain percentage of the production of oil or gas or minerals or fishing rights, or whatever it may be, beyond the limits over land owned or claimed by the United States. Unless you do that, you go back to the fundamental threat of breaking down the sovereignty of the State of Louisiana, and I do not think that that is the best thing for the future of the United States of America. I am certain it is not going to be the most satisfactory way to handle the thing for a State like my own State, the State of Louisiana.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALTER).

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, like the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HALLECK) I have had enough of this legislation.

The question of procedure has been raised on 2 or 3 occasions. The gentleman who just preceded me on 4 separate occasions mentioned the fact that this bill was introduced at 1:30 and at 2 o'clock the committee obtained a rule. Without an explanation, that does not sound like the usual procedure that we use. However, it is important to remember that the bill under consideration was thoroughly debated by this House. This language is not new. The proposal is as old as is the legislation. All the Committee on the Judiciary did on yesterday was report a bill which is identical, with but one exception, with the bill that has passed the House. I will point out that exception. During the course of the debate on the rule, I said it was identical. The one difference lies in this provision on page 10, lines 18 and 19, with respect to the severance tax. There is no such thing in the Federal law. Where the leases are transferred from the State to the Federal Government, then the additional cost which would be represented in the severance tax would be added to the lease, so that the company engaged in the development would not by virtue of the transfer of leases get an advantage over somebody who had bought originally. That is the only change in this section 3, which is now incorporated in H. R. 4156.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, than whom there is not a better lawyer in our great State, and not many better in this body, talked about the President's debt. I am not concerned with the debt of President Eisenhower, our great Chief Executive, nor was I concerned with the position taken by his predecessor. When the attorneys general of the United States, not 44, as was stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GRAHAM), but 47 of them, reached a unanimous agreement with respect to this proposition and it was then referred to the Judiciary Committee, and as a matter of course referred to the subcommittee of which at the moment I happen to be the chairman, I examined their position carefully. I was not only deeply impressed by what

they said and by what they attempted to do, but I was so impressed by the position taken by Mr. Justice Frankfurter that no amount of argument here or advanced in the other chamber would change my views.

They add up to just this one simple proposition: How territory admittedly the property of the State became the property of the United States will always be a mystery to me. The United States never had any title to the territory under consideration in the bill that we recently passed and on which we will again be called to act in a few moments, but we have never declared our sovereignty in that land beyond the historical boundaries. All we are trying to do here today is for all time to dispose of this conflict. I do not contend that by this declaration of sovereignty the United States obtains title to the entire Continental Shelf. But I do contend that now at long last the people who are interested in the development of the resources lying beyond the historic boundaries know to whom they can turn in order to obtain a binding agreement so that the millions of dollars they invest will be protected to some extent.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Is that true with respect to land lying seaward 3 miles of the Louisiana coastline?

Mr. WALTER. I am thoroughly convinced that the State of Louisiana has control over the historic boundaries beyond the 3 miles. I am not contending about title. However, the Norwegian fishing case, recently decided by the International Court, perhaps decides that question.

Mr. Chairman, we heard much about the other body accepting this bill. Of course, as our distinguished majority leader said, we do not know what will be done in the other Chamber. But, I call your attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 28 on page 4114. I am certain I am not violating the rules of the House by reading from that Record. It is as follows:

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that so far as the Continental Shelf is concerned, a bill is being prepared by the committee. I am sure it will be here within 2 weeks; and I can assure Senators that the whole subject will be dealt with comprehensively in that bill, and will have most careful study.

Mr. Chairman, I for one am willing to run the risk of assuming that the assurance extended to the Senators is also extended to the Members of this body.

We heard much about the giveaway legislation. Why do you know it would be to the financial advantage of these oil companies if the Federal Government had control of all of this territory? That is a fact.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this particular point?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Now that you have mentioned the word giveaway, I am sure with your legal talent, you will agree that if someone gives to another something that the Supreme Court says is

his and gives it without any consideration whatsoever, it must be pretty much of a gift, and a gift is a giveaway. I mean that is the law of the land.

The Supreme Court said that the States had no title to or interest in any of these submerged lands seaward from their low watermark—

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further because I would like to answer the gentleman's question. Of course, the Supreme Court did not pass on the question of title. It merely said that the United States had a paramount interest. That is what the Supreme Court said and it left the entire question up to the Congress. As a matter of fact in every announcement coming from the highest Court of the land, there was contained an open invitation to the Congress of the United States to dispose of this question. Now there is no giveaway and there never has been anything like a giveaway involved except in the minds of those people who are so committed to the philosophy of an all powerful Federal Government that they see in this an opportunity to carry out those principles.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes additional to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to thank the Republican leadership, the leadership of this House, for its sincerity and its honesty in carrying in its platform an honest, straightforward plank that at least a portion of these tidelands would be returned to the States, and then getting some action upon that promise.

Enough has been said about the tidelands bill to fill many volumes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or in the Congressional Library. I do not know of anything new that has been stated in the last two times the bill has been on the floor for debate. The same issues have been rehashed, carried over, and the same cry of "giveaway," "steal," and all that sort of thing has been carried on, especially in the other body by this talkathon and by the filibuster that was carried on, admittedly, but no new fact has been brought forth to show that the States have not owned this property at all times; have claimed it adversely and notoriously against all parties, including the Federal Government; and their rights were recognized repeatedly by the Supreme Court. I do not think there is anything to the claim that this bill was jumped up suddenly without hearings, because this very language stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], former chairman of the subcommittee, has been gone over and voted out of the committee at least twice before since I have been a member of the Judiciary Committee, and once before that. This is simply title III of the original Walter bill.

I have some objections to title III, and it is no secret, because I offered some amendments when the bill was before the House recently. I offered an amend-

ment to put in the bill the right of the States to reasonable taxing power. This House turned that down flatly. Therefore, I am not belaboring the issue, because we made an honest attempt, and I believe that the contiguous States to this territory, whose roads, schools, and public service will be used by the people who develop and exploit this territory, whose roads will be wrecked and ruined, should have some power of the right of taxation. This bill does not contain it, but I am not going to vote against the bill because it does not contain it. I think, in all fairness, proration and State police powers should apply in that area, because we all know the Federal proration laws, and a serious situation could arise if these wells to be developed by Federal leaseholders should ever produce oil contiguous to the State's territory as opposing the State and Federal lands. But I say none of those things are serious enough to make me vote against this bill.

I think the only way we are going to get any legislation on this subject is to deal with both subjects and to get rid of them now. Oh, I know my distinguished former chairman says the demagogues claim that the President is paying off the Governor of Texas. That may go in New York, but it certainly does not sound very good in Texas. The President is paying off nobody; and I will say to you that if sincerity and honesty of purpose mean anything I think the President is going to make a great President, I think he is keeping a campaign pledge. This matter was voted on by the people last year and this was one of the material issues in my State, it so happened. We just do not believe in folks stealing, especially the Federal Government.

But with all those objections—and I think the bill could be improved by their adoption—I am going to vote for the bill because I think, frankly, if the other bill had gone to conference it would only have amounted to longer delay and another filibuster in the Senate if 1 comma or 1 period had been changed in this body. No wonder they wanted a conference; no wonder they wanted to take the bill back. They would have another great circus over there, but we would have no tidelands legislation.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman is now talking about the Senate bill which we will take up a little later. I wonder if the gentleman will get back to the bill before the Committee?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I shall be glad to.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman himself is the author of a tidelands bill, is he not?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I am.

Mr. BOGGS. What does the gentleman's bill provide with regard to the Continental Shelf?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I just made my position very clear when I said I believed the States should have taxing power and police power. It is also provided that the States should receive 37½ percent royalty.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman's bill contained that provision?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Yes, it did.

Mr. BOGGS. Does this bill contain that provision?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. It does not.

Mr. BOGGS. Yet, the gentleman intends to vote for this bill?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I do.

Mr. BOGGS. On what theory?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. When we had the other bill before the House we tried to put those amendments in and we were defeated some 4 or 5 to 1, and I am taking this bill as a last resort and as the best bill possible to get from this House and the Congress as a whole. My position is clear and I am not hesitating about it at all.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman has now acceded to the position of complete Federal domination.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. No; I have not, because the bill that comes next on this floor gives the States absolute rights.

Mr. BOGGS. But I am talking about the bill now before us.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I refuse to yield further. I know the gentleman from Louisiana has to justify his position.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Texas is justifying his position; he has reversed himself.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I understand; I know something about that.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. May I interpose at this point and say that no man contended more seriously and strenuously for his position than did the gentleman from Texas. The same may be said likewise about the gentleman from Louisiana. Both did everything within their power to advance their interests and they were defeated only because we had the greater votes.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Of course, we can continue for months and years talking about taxing power and police power and what the States would like to get out of the revenue, but when we do we get away from our theory—at least the Texas theory, and that is that our claim—and the only claim which we can really justify and which we think without doubt we have, our historical boundary of 10½ miles. Many of us, of course, have thought that inasmuch as the State services would be used we should have a reasonable taxing power; and I still think and still say that before too long unless an amendment is adopted to this bill applying State proration laws and reasonable police powers that this Congress will be called upon to enact Federal laws to set up a proration law and a law against waste, and it will also be called upon to pass a law providing criminal penalties in cases involving crime. I think that should have been done in this bill, and I think it could have been done and would have been done if certain amendments had been adopted when this bill was before the House some weeks ago. As I say, these amendments were turned down. I am supporting this bill because I believe

it is the only way we are going to get legislation to end this subject for all time.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time only to call the attention of the members of the committee to the very serious new problems being raised by this legislation regarding civil and criminal jurisdiction over structures erected in the outer Continental Shelf seaward from territorial waters. There is no precedent which tells us what body of law is applicable to structures in the outer Continental Shelf.

The bill we are passing today, H. R. 5134, expressly declares the waters above the Continental Shelf to be high seas, international waters.

The closest analogy to the problem of punishment for criminal offenses committed on structures on the high seas is, of course, the punishment for offenses on vessels on the high seas.

I wish to direct the attention of the Members to the law relating to criminal law jurisdiction on the Guano Islands. These islands are not declared to be territory of the United States but are said to appertain to the United States. I refer to title 48, United States Code, section 1417. It reads as follows:

All acts done, and offenses or crimes committed on any island, rock, or key mentioned in section 1411 of this title, by persons who may land thereon, or in the waters adjacent thereto, shall be deemed committed on the high seas, on board a merchant ship or vessel belonging to the United States; and shall be punished according to the laws of the United States relating to such ships or vessels and offenses on the high seas, which laws for the purpose aforesaid are extended over such islands, rocks, and keys.

I also direct attention to title 18, United States Code, section 451, paragraph 4, of which also relates to the Guano Islands. That section reads as follows:

The crimes and offenses defined in sections 451-468 of this title shall be punished as herein prescribed:

First. When committed upon the high seas, or on any other waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and out of the jurisdiction of any particular State, or when committed within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and out of the jurisdiction of any particular State on board any vessel belonging in whole or in part to the United States or any citizen thereof, or to any corporation created by or under the laws of the United States, or of any State, Territory, or district thereof.

Second. When committed upon any vessel registered, licensed, or enrolled under the laws of the United States, and being on a voyage upon the waters of any of the Great Lakes, namely: Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, Lake Saint Clair, Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, or any of the waters connecting any of said lakes, or upon the River St. Lawrence where the same constitutes the international boundary line.

Third. When committed within or on any lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States, and under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction thereof, or any place purchased or otherwise acquired by the United States by concept of the legislation of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of a fort, magazine, arsenal, dockyard, or other needful building.

Fourth. On any island, rock, or key; containing deposits of guano, which may, at the discretion of the President, be considered as appertaining to the United States.

Inserting language similar to title 48, section 1417, in the bill before us might solve the problem so far as criminal jurisdiction is concerned. However, we still would not have dealt with the civil law jurisdiction over these structures, nor with the problem of what legislation is applicable on these structures, such as workmen's compensation laws, wage and hour laws, and so forth. Actually the waters above the Continental Shelf are expressly recognized as international waters, not a part of the territory of the United States or of any State of the United States. The field of law with respect to structures in these international waters is almost completely uncharted. It deserved more concentrated attention than it has been given by the Judiciary Committee of the House.

I do not intend to offer an amendment because the speed with which the Judiciary Committee and the House are acting on this bill did not allow sufficient time for me to study the matter and propose language which in my opinion would constitute a satisfactory solution to this complex and difficult legal problem.

For that reason I have merely called attention to the existence of the problem and have offered a suggested solution to one phase of it in the hope that the other body, or perhaps the conference committee if there is a conference, will deal with the subject adequately and intelligently.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill as it stands with reference to the territory to which it extends I believe is an excellent bill, a bill that is very much needed. My contention is that Federal control should begin at the low-water mark and extend seaward. There are in the Gulf of Mexico beyond the Continental Shelf outside of the historic or 3-mile boundary of Texas and Louisiana oil-producing wells and there are also other areas which should be developed for our national defense and for our general welfare.

In other areas beyond the three-mile limit or historic boundary there are leases under which operations had started for drilling purposes but they have had to be stopped or curtailed under authorization of the Secretary of the Interior. He is permitted under his inherent right, only to continue drillings that had already started or to initiate new drillings when it would be for the protection of an adjoining area. The Secretary of Interior cannot authorize new and additional explorations unless congressional authorization is given him.

Mr. Chairman, I opposed the rule on this bill because I felt that this body would be in a much better position if we would reject the Senate amendments to H. R. 4198 and send the bill to conference where this body's conferees would then be able to present to the conference committee the argument and the will of this body and adopt in toto title III, in addition to title I and title II. It is

quite obvious to me, in spite of glowing assurances, that the Members of the other body will not readily accept this bill, H. R. 5134 when we pass it. I am quite confident that they will endeavor to obtain for the coastal States a sizable proportionate share of the royalties derived from oil and any minerals that may be obtained in submerged lands beyond the 3-mile limit or the historic State boundaries. My reason for thinking in that direction, is that legislation has been introduced in the other body which would give the coastal States control of the leasing, control of the conservation, authority to assess severance taxes, and State police powers, and also demanding 37½ percent royalty. I think we in this House, out of an abundance of caution, should refuse to accept the Senate amendments. We should send H. R. 4198 to conference so that we can really make a fight to include in its entirety title III along with title I and title II.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take this time to answer any of the previous questions that were brought up with reference to the title of any of these submerged lands inside the historic boundaries, or the 3-mile limit, which the Supreme Court has decided belong to the Federal Government, as that is of no concern in this particular bill, because this bill gives lock, stock and barrel to the Federal Government jurisdiction and control in its own right to keep unto itself and all of the royalties or resources that might be taken from the submerged lands beyond the 3-mile limit or historic boundaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY].

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand how anyone can seriously find fault with the action the committee has taken in considering the areas inside of historic State boundaries and such boundaries in two separate bills because actually I think we all recognize that two different sets of principles are involved in these areas. Inside the historic boundary we are dealing with an area that always belonged to the States until the decision of the Supreme Court cast doubt upon the title, but when you go beyond the historic seaward boundaries of the States you are dealing with an area that is altogether different. It is not only outside of the States, it is outside of the United States. We are dealing with it only on the legal basis of a proclamation of the President of the United States claiming, not title to the lands outside of the historic State and national boundaries, but rather claiming only the right to extract the resources of the seabed and the subsoil and to the edge of the Continental Shelf. Historically, legally, and in every way you are dealing with an entirely different proposition when you deal with the area known as the Continental Shelf.

It is very difficult for me to understand some of the opposition to this bill. It gives everything to the Federal Government. Some of the people who opposed giving the States back that which has al-

ways been theirs are opposing this bill although it gives everything beyond State boundaries to the Federal Government.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] was arguing here a few minutes ago that there is a trend toward giving the States more and the Federal Government less. Actually this bill represents a trend in the other direction. Bills previously passed here gave the States 37.5 percent of the royalties out in this area. This bill gives the States nothing, so the trend of this bill is toward greater Federal control of, and all the revenue derived from, the area involved, I should think the people who favor Federal ownership of all submerged lands would support this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YORTY. So, I repeat, the trend evidenced by this bill is toward taking away from the States and not giving to the States.

Actually, I find myself in the same position as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON]. I introduced a bill similar to his. It would have given the States the right to do the leasing out in this area, and it would have given them a percentage of the royalties. I did that because I thought it would be better to have one administration for the entire area. I felt that since basically, the fight is not over administration of the area but over the division of the proceeds from it, so long as you gave the Federal Government the major part of the proceeds, I could see no harm but, rather, definite advantages from the standpoint of recovery and efficiency in letting the States administer the whole area, while keeping a reasonable percentage of the royalties as compensation for services performed.

After debate in the House that provision was taken out. I think, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] pointed out, it became obvious that you could not again at this time get a bill through the House with a provision giving the States 37.5 percent of the revenues. I am sorry this is true. I would rather see it that way. But since this appears impossible, and since there is no law under which this area can now be administered, and it ought to be developed, it seems to me we should support this legislation as the best we can pass by a majority vote of the House.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YORTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman says the area should be developed. Does this include the whole Continental Shelf, including that area which is given to the States by the bill?

Mr. YORTY. As the gentleman knows, this bill deals only with the area outside the historical State boundaries.

Mr. YATES. Suppose the Supreme Court of the United States should declare the other bill unconstitutional. Should not the area be developed by the Federal Government then?

Mr. YORTY. A law of the Congress is presumed to be constitutional until

the Court rules otherwise. I do not know by what authority some people are already purporting to decide the constitutionality of the Submerged Lands Act in advance and to hold it invalid. Frankly, I think it is constitutional. We will have to leave that question to the courts anyway.

Mr. YATES. It is nevertheless possible that the Supreme Court of the United States might declare the bill unconstitutional; is it not?

Mr. YORTY. It is always possible that any law may be declared unconstitutional, but the presumptions, as the gentleman knows, are in favor of constitutionality. With the saving clause that has been put in the bill, if it turns out that we could not constitutionally grant full title to the States, they would retain the right to develop the area anyway. I do not see what anyone would have to gain by challenging the constitutionality of that act, if my views are correct.

Getting back to the proposition of this bill, it just seems to me that as a practical matter this is the kind of bill we should all approve since we cannot now get a majority to give the States greater rights in the area in question, the outer Continental Shelf. It is possible that experience will prove the advisability of letting the States administer the entire offshore area under one set of laws and regulations. In this event the State will be entitled to compensation for their services and I feel that limited taxing power or a share of the revenue will be the proper measure.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to ask a question on the bill. I do this because of my doubts concerning the constitutionality of the basic legislation giving title to the submerged lands to the States. I have no illusions concerning my ability as a great constitutional lawyer, and I make no claim of enjoying the prestige and dignity of being a great constitutional lawyer. But having read the debates on tidelands bills of previous years, I noted that a very able constitutional lawyer declared that in his opinion, such bills would be unconstitutional. I refer to our former distinguished colleague, the late Sam Hobbs, who stated that this bill would violate the Constitution. I now ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] what would be the jurisdiction of the Federal Government in the event that the other tidelands bill, the one previously passed by this House and recently passed by the other body, should be held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States? Would the Federal Government under the terms of this bill have any jurisdiction over the area covered by the other bill?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Do I understand your question to be that if the States' historical boundary bill is held to be unconstitutional, this bill gives the Federal Government the right to move in and develop the area within the historical boundaries?

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. In my opinion, it certainly would not.

Mr. YATES. In other words, this bill deals only with the portion of the Continental Shelf outside that area?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Beginning at the outer edge of the historic boundary of the States, which is 3 miles only except for the States of Texas and Florida, and on out.

Mr. YATES. I see. But does not the gentleman concede that in the event the other bill was held unconstitutional that the Federal Government under existing decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States would have jurisdiction over that area?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. No, I do not think they would.

Mr. YATES. Then who would have jurisdiction over it?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Congress would have to deal with it again.

Mr. YATES. You mean that nobody would have any jurisdiction over it?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Do you mean inside of the State boundaries?

Mr. YATES. That is right.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. We would be in the same position as we were in before we passed the bill. We could change it.

Mr. YATES. And according to the Supreme Court of the United States does not the Federal Government have paramount interest in those lands?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Paramount rights, yes, that is all, but not ownership.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS], a member of the committee.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I will require 5 minutes to discuss briefly what I have in mind. I had been supporting the tidelands bill since its inception. I have been supporting it because I believe the legislation is needed and necessary; I have been supporting the bill in order to restore to the States what I believe has been unjustly taken away from them by the split decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. I have been supporting this measure because I think it is the right and honorable thing to do. That covers my first approach to this very, very important piece of legislation. But, I am not in favor of carrying on with the adoption of this legislation unless it carries with it the provisions that are noted in the Graham bill. I think our activities in connection with legislating on this important measure should be confined exclusively to that which we originally started out to accomplish, to wit, to establish the boundaries of the States over which we have this existing controversy which, I understand includes the 3-mile limit and a 10½-mile limit for the States of Texas and Florida. We should adopt a hands-off policy as it applies to submerged land referred to as the Continental Shelf—I mean by that, that the States should confine their control over submerged lands strictly to what we started out to do. For that reason, I see only one hope in sustaining this legislation ultimately in the United States Supreme Court, and that is to keep our faith with the people and our promises as we originally made them and return to the States what they have been divested of, and leave title exclusively

and unconditionally in the Federal Government to that submerged land area that has always been recognized as Government property.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is another of the days of the great betrayal. On another day of infamy this body voted to pay the price of the presidency with the surrender of the Nation's wealth and security to the powers of oil and of darkness. All that Abraham Lincoln represented in the history of this Nation, all that the defenders of the Union gave, even to the last supreme sacrifice, was made a mess for the mockery of Republicans from the North and East. Today there comes in the consideration of H. R. 5134 a proposition to powder-puff the face of Judas with perfumed beauty aids. I doubt the soundness of the proposition that by applying whitewash to the wings of a bat you come forth with an angel.

This body passed a bill covering the submerged lands to the Continental Shelf. The other body labored hard and long and came forth with a bill that went as far as the traditional boundary lines and stopped there. So it is proposed that we first vote upon the part of the bill that the other body left out—a part of the bill that no one seriously thinks will ever be taken up and acted upon favorably by the other body. Why are we asked in this weird parliamentary procedure to vote upon what in substance is an amendment to a nonexistent bill? The answer is, of course, that H. R. 5134 is a gesture in futility. It is as a device arranged for the convenience of indiscretion to proclaim virtue on the threshold of the door.

I shall vote against the passage both of H. R. 4198 and 5134 because I cannot in good conscience have any association with what to me appears the boldest conspiracy in history to sell out the security and the resources of a great Nation. The evil and intended work of today is to accept the other body's amendments to H. R. 4198, thus sidestepping a conference committee, and getting this colossal grab measure immediately to the White House.

The distinguished and able majority leader has forthrightly told us that he wants to have the matter over with as quickly as possible so that the House can proceed to other business. If the gentleman hopes that in the consideration of other business the country will forget what happened today he will wake up to wonder why he never placed more faith in the 13 superstition. May 13, 1953, is a date that patriotic indignation will burn indelibly in the minds of the men and women of America.

I have no doubt a sense of gratitude for past favors will again manifest itself on the other side of the aisle. My Republican colleagues, with few exceptions again will go down the line in the payment of the price of a presidency. The kiss that the Republican Members of this House will plant on the oily lips of the tidelands bill will prove to be the kiss of death for the Republican Party. Let them pursue their amorous flirtation with oil with the reckless abandon of a night of illicit romancing, but let them

know that tomorrow will come as surely as the earth will continue to move in its orbit.

Mr. Chairman, it is significant that on the very eve of the consummation of the infamous tidelands oil deal announcement was made of the sensational growth of billion dollar business in the United States. There are now 29 businesses with assets of \$1 billion and more.

The 13 top money makers—in terms of net profits—are General Motors, Standard of New Jersey, Bell, du Pont, Texas, Socony-Vacuum, Standard of California, General Electric, United States Steel, Gulf Oil, Standard of Indiana, Sears, Roebuck, and Ford.

The billion dollarists, which excludes insurance and finance companies and banks, follows:

Bell system.....	\$10,734,348,860
Standard Oil Co. (N. J.)....	5,049,282,673
General Motors Corp.....	4,001,294,708
Pennsylvania Railroad.....	3,133,518,486
United States Steel Corp....	2,988,434,756
New York Central.....	2,613,903,655
Du Pont de Nemours & Co..	2,371,140,879
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.....	2,011,336,643
Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)..	1,993,876,666
Southern Pacific.....	1,954,415,377
Pacific Gas & Electric Co..	1,795,337,509
Consolidated Edison Co. (N. Y.).....	1,773,317,755
Texas Co.....	1,736,081,000
Gulf Oil Co.....	1,627,279,394
Bethlehem Steel Corp.....	1,610,078,107
Ford Motor Co. (1951)....	1,584,172,000
General Electric Co.....	1,579,523,878
Santa Fe.....	1,462,710,435
Commonwealth Edison Co..	1,434,664,667
Standard Oil Co. (Calif.)..	1,407,198,494
Sears, Roebuck & Co.....	1,362,011,465
Union Pacific.....	1,308,378,450
Baltimore & Ohio.....	1,295,167,047
Westinghouse Electric Corp.	1,195,292,040
Humble Oil.....	1,108,223,714
International Harvester....	1,090,644,236
Union Carbide & Carbon....	1,072,178,149
Cities Service Co.....	1,047,080,707
Sinclair Oil Co.....	1,035,307,940

The above list is the directory of the invisible government of the United States. The corporations on the list are closely bound together, and by far the largest group is that of oil. The power of billion-dollar corporations can be effective in campaigns when the people are not alerted to the real issues. When that power is used to divest them of their resources and to take from them their national security the story will be different.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Submerged Lands Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraphs:

"(1) The term 'outer Continental Shelf' means all submerged lands (1) which lie outside and seaward of lands beneath navigable waters as defined hereinabove in section 2, and (2) of which the subsoil and natural resources appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction and control;

"(j) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior;

"(k) The term 'lease' whenever used with reference to action by a State or its political subdivision or grantee shall be regarded as including any form of authorization for the use, development, or production from lands beneath navigable waters or lands of the outer Continental Shelf and the natural re-

sources therein and thereunder, and the term 'lessee' whenever used in such connection shall be regarded as including any person having the right to develop or produce natural resources and any person having the right to use or develop lands beneath navigable waters or lands of the outer Continental Shelf under any such form of authorization;

"(1) The term 'Mineral Leasing Act' means the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), and all acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 1, line 6, after the words "submerged lands", strike out all of lines 6 and 7 and that part of line 8 preceding the word "of".

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, there are two masses of land involved in this legislation. There is the land given to the States by the bills that have passed this House and the other body, the so-called submerged-lands bills, and then there is the land that is seaward of the historical boundaries of the States. That is the land of the Continental Shelf which is proposed to be covered by this legislation.

My amendment is applicable to the land which is within the so-called historic boundaries of the States. The purpose of my amendment is to permit exploitation and development of that territory in the event that the submerged-lands bill is declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States.

As I stated a few moments ago, I make no claim of being an authoritative constitutional lawyer myself. I happen to believe the bill is unconstitutional. More than my opinion, however, is that of a man for whose legal ability on constitutional matters, many Members of this House had the highest respect. I refer to the gentleman from Alabama, the late Sam Hobbs, who stated time and again that a statute on this question without a constitutional amendment, would be inadequate to convey title to lands to the States. It would be unconstitutional. Therefore, in the event that the opinion of Mr. Hobbs is sustained, if the Supreme Court of the United States holds that bill to be unconstitutional, this legislation would permit exploitation of the area that has been given to the States under the other bill. That area would be a no-man's land, a territory under Federal control, but without power in the Federal Government to develop its resources, if additional legislation for that purpose is needed. I say it would belong to the Federal Government, because the Supreme Court of the United States has stated in its decisions that the submerged lands seaward of the low-water mark belong to the Federal Government. If that bill is held unconstitutional, there will be no legislative authority in the Federal Government to develop the oil resources.

I call attention to the language on page 2 of the report which states:

Representatives of the Federal departments, the States, and the offshore operators all urged the importance and necessity for the enactment of legislation enabling the Federal Government to lease for oil and

gas operations the vast areas of the Continental Shelf outside of State boundaries. They were unanimously of the opinion, in which this committee agrees, that no law now exists whereby the Federal Government can lease those submerged lands, the development and operation of which are vital to our national economy and security. It is, therefore, the duty of the Congress to enact promptly a leasing policy for the purpose of encouraging the discovery and development of the oil potential of the Continental Shelf.

My amendment would permit the Federal Government to undertake the exploitation of all lands to which it has paramount rights.

In the event the Supreme Court sustains the legislation and holds it constitutional the States will not be hurt. They will be able to continue to exploit the mineral and oil resources lying under the submerged lands within their boundaries. The amendment I have offered will fill the gap caused by unconstitutionality of the bill and permit development of the entire submerged area, pending the efforts of the coastal States to obtain a constitutional amendment to obtain title to the submerged lands bordering their shoreline.

I ask for a favorable vote on my amendment.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it should not take 5 minutes to dispose of this amendment because all this does is to surrender the entire area seaward from the coastline of the United States to the international domain; a domain wherein foreign vessels, warships, or other craft could sail up and down and do as they pleased without any control over them by the United States. If you will refer to the language on page 3, the second paragraph, you will find this provision:

This act shall be construed in such manner that the character as high seas of the waters above the outer Continental Shelf and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation and navigational servitude shall not be affected.

That means in dealing with the outer Continental Shelf the area outside of the United States the right of foreign nations to use the areas for shipping and so forth are not affected.

If we were to adopt this amendment, which does not fit in with the rest of the bill, but defines the whole offshore area as outer Continental Shelf, making the high seas above them international domain, it would be a very unwise action.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YORTY. I yield.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will consider the amendment he will note that the term "outer Continental Shelf" means all submerged lands and natural resources appertaining to the United States in accordance with the definition in the other bill. My amendment would not change the language in the other bill but would clarify it. If the other definition is followed, the submerged land lying seaward of the historic State boundaries would belong to the Federal Government. There is nothing in my amendment which would deprive the States of any interest in the lands within their historic State boundaries if the

Supreme Court holds that bill constitutional. My amendment gives rights to the Federal Government only if the bill is held unconstitutional.

Mr. YORTY. I think the gentleman is incorrect because this refers back to the definition in the submerged lands act which will become a law and changes that definition so that seaward of the coastline the whole area would be outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. YATES. On the contrary, all this definition does is state that it is applicable to the land which belongs to the United States.

Mr. YORTY. It does not say "belong," it says "appertains."

Mr. YATES. All right, appertains to the United States.

Mr. YORTY. If the gentleman will permit me, he is assuming as a fact that the submerged lands act has been declared unconstitutional.

Mr. YATES. I make no such assumption. I recognize it as a possibility, and in the event the bill is not declared unconstitutional the title of the States will not be impaired. In the event it is declared unconstitutional, then there would be this safeguard to permit the resources to be exploited.

Mr. YORTY. That is not correct, either. Even if the act were sustained as constitutional, what we have here would be inconsistent with the other act. You are setting up a conflict that would have to be resolved, because the gentleman's amendment refers to the submerged lands act, and it will become a law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The Submerged Lands Act is further amended by striking out sections 9, 10, and 11 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE III

"OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OUTSIDE STATE BOUNDARIES

"SEC. 9. Jurisdiction over outer Continental Shelf: (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction, control, and power of disposition as provided in this act. Federal laws now in effect or hereafter adopted shall apply to the entire area of the outer Continental Shelf. The Secretary is hereby empowered and authorized to administer the provisions of this title, and to adopt rules and regulations not inconsistent with Federal laws to apply to the area.

"Except to the extent that they are inconsistent with applicable Federal laws now in effect or hereafter enacted, or such regulations as the Secretary may adopt, the laws of each coastal State which so provide shall be applicable to that portion of the outer Continental Shelf which would be within the area of the State if its boundaries were extended seaward to the outer margin of the outer Continental Shelf, and the Secretary shall determine and publish lines defining each such area of State jurisdiction: *Provided, however,* That State taxation laws shall not apply in such areas of the outer Continental Shelf. The Secretary shall reimburse the abutting States in the amount of the reasonable costs of the administration of such laws.

"This act shall be construed in such manner that the character as high seas of the waters above the outer Continental Shelf and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation and navigational servitude shall not be affected.

"(b) Oil and gas deposits in the outer Continental Shelf shall be subject to control and disposal only in accordance with the provisions of this act and no rights in or claims to such deposits, whether based upon applications filed or other action taken heretofore or hereafter, shall be recognized except in accordance with the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 10. Provisions for leasing outer Continental Shelf: (a) When in the Secretary's opinion there is a demand for the purchase of such leases, the Secretary may in his discretion offer for sale, on competitive sealed bidding, oil and gas leases on any area of the outer Continental Shelf. Subject to the other terms and provisions hereof, sales of leases shall be made to the responsible and qualified bidder bidding the highest cash bonus per leasing unit. Notice of sale of oil and gas leases shall be published at least 30 days before the date of sale in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary, which publication shall contain (i) a description of the tracts into which the area to be leased has been subdivided by the Secretary for leasing purposes, such tracts being herein called 'leasing units'; (ii) the minimum bonus per acre which will be accepted by the Secretary on each leasing unit; (iii) the amount of royalty as specified hereinafter in section 10 (d); (iv) the amount of rental per acre per annum on each leasing unit as specified hereinafter in section 10 (d); and (v) the time and place at which all bids shall be opened in public.

"(b) The leasing units shall be in reasonably compact form of such area and dimensions as may be determined by the Secretary, but shall not be more than 640 acres if within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field and shall not be more than 2,560 acres if not within any known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field.

"(c) Oil and gas leases sold under the provisions of this section shall be for the primary terms of 5 years and shall continue so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced therefrom in paying quantities. Each lease shall contain provisions requiring the exercise of reasonable diligence, skill, and care in the operation of the lease, and requiring the lessee to conduct his operations thereon in accordance with sound and efficient oil-field practices to prevent waste of oil or gas discovered under said lease or the entrance of water through wells drilled by him to the oil or gas sands or oil- and gas-bearing strata or the injury or destruction of the oil and gas deposits.

"(d) Each lease shall provide that, on or after the discovery of oil or gas, the lessee shall pay a royalty of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold from the leasing unit and, in any event, not less than \$1 per acre per annum in lieu of rental for each lease year commencing after discovery in addition to any taxes imposed by Congress. If after discovery of oil or gas the production thereof should cease from any cause, the lease shall not terminate if the lessee commences additional drilling or reworking operations within 90 days thereafter or, if it be within the primary term, commences or resumes the payment or tender of rentals or commences operations for drilling or reworking on or before the rental paying date next ensuing after the expiration of 90 days from date of cessation of production. All leases issued hereunder shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of a rental of \$1 per acre per annum for the second and

every lease year thereafter during the primary terms and in lieu of drilling operations on or production from the leasing unit in addition to any taxes imposed by Congress, all such rentals to be payable on or before the beginning of each lease year.

"(e) If, at the expiration of the primary term of any lease, oil or gas is not being produced in paying quantities on a leasing unit, but drilling operations are commenced not less than 180 days prior to the end of the primary term and such drilling operations or other drilling operations have been and are being diligently prosecuted and the lessee has otherwise performed his obligations under the lease, the lease shall remain in force so long as drilling operations are prosecuted with reasonable diligence and in a good and workmanlike manner, and rental paid, and if they result in the production of oil or gas so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced therefrom in paying quantities.

"(f) Should a lessee in a lease issued under the provisions of title III of this act fail to comply with any of the provisions of this act or of the lease, such lease may be canceled by the Secretary because of such failure; but before such a cancellation the Secretary shall give the lessee 20 days' notice by registered mail at his last known address of the claimed defaults. If the defaults are not cured by the end of said period the Secretary may proceed to cancel the lease. Any person complaining of such cancellation may have such action reviewed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. If a lease or any interest therein is owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, in violation of any of the provisions of this act, the lease may be canceled, or the interest so owned or controlled may be forfeited by the Secretary as provided in this paragraph, or the person so owning or controlling the interest may be compelled to dispose of the interest in an appropriate court proceeding.

"(g) The provisions of sections 17, 17 (b), 28, 30, 30 (a), 30 (b), 32, 36, and 39 of the Mineral Leasing Act to the extent that such provisions are not inconsistent with the terms of this act, are made applicable to lands leased or subject to lease by the Secretary under title III of this act.

"(h) In the interest of economy and of cooperation between Federal and State leasing agencies within their respective jurisdictions, the Secretary may, but only to the extent he deems feasible, make use of facilities available to him from the adjacent States and their leasing agencies. Each lease shall contain such other terms and provisions consistent with the provisions of this act as may be prescribed by the Secretary. The Secretary may delegate his authority under this act to officers or employees of the Department of the Interior and may authorize subdelegation to the extent that he may deem proper.

"(i) The Secretary may deny any application for a lease, as to which it appears that the lease, if issued, or any interest therein, would be owned or controlled, directly or by stock ownership, stockholding, stock control, trusteeship, or otherwise, by any citizen of another country, the laws, customs, or regulations of which deny similar or like privileges to citizens or corporations of this country. Where such ownership or control arises after a lease is granted, the Secretary may then cancel the lease because thereof. Any ownership or interest described in this section which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held for 2 years and not longer after its acquisition. No lands leased under the provisions of this section shall be subleased, trusted, possessed, or controlled by any device or in any manner whatsoever so that they form a part of or are in anywise controlled by any combination in the form of an unlawful trust or form the subject in whole or in part of

any contract, agreement, understanding, or conspiracy, to restrain trade or commerce in the production or sale of oil or gas or to control the price of oil or gas.

"(j) Any lease obtained through the exercise of fraud or misrepresentation, or which is not performed in accordance with its terms or with this law, may by the Secretary be invalidated subject to the right of review as otherwise provided for herein.

"Sec. 11. Exchange of existing State leases in outer Continental Shelf for Federal leases: (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to issue a lease to any person in exchange for a lease covering lands in the outer Continental Shelf which was issued by any State prior to December 21, 1948, and which would have been in force and effect on June 5, 1950, in accordance with its terms and provisions except as modified as to additional royalties provided later in this section and the laws of the State issuing such lease had the State issuing such lease had such paramount rights in and dominion over the outer Continental Shelf as it assumed it had when it issued the lease. Any lease issued pursuant to this section shall be for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the unexpired term of the old lease, or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantees issued, the same: *Provided, however*, That if oil or gas was not being produced from such old lease on and before December 11, 1950, or if the primary term of such lease has expired since December 11, 1950, then any such new lease shall be for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of the old lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing or whose grantees issued such lease, shall cover the same natural resources and the same portion of the Continental Shelf as the old lease, shall provide for payment to the United States of the same rentals, royalties, and other payments as are provided for in the old lease, together with a sum as additional royalty equal to any severance tax charged by an abutting State, in addition to any taxes imposed by Congress, and shall include such other terms and provisions, consistent with the provisions of this act, as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Operations under such old lease may be conducted as therein provided until the issuance of an exchange lease hereunder or until it is determined that no such exchange lease shall be issued. No lease which has been determined by the Secretary to have been obtained by fraud or misrepresentation shall be accepted for exchange under this section. Any persons complaining of a refusal by the Secretary so to exchange a lease as herein provided may have such action reviewed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

"(b) No such exchange lease shall be issued unless, (i) an application therefor, accompanied by a copy of the lease from the State or its political subdivision or grantee offered in exchange, is filed with the Secretary within 6 months from the effective date of this act, or within such further period as provided in section 18 hereof, or as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary; (ii) the applicant states in his application that the lease applied for shall be subject to the same overriding royalty obligations as the lease issued by the State or its political subdivision or grantee in addition to any taxes imposed by Congress; (iii) the applicant pays to the United States all rentals, royalties, and other sums due to the lessor under the old lease which have or may become payable after June 5, 1950, and which have not been paid to the lessor or to the Secretary under the old lease; (iv) the applicant furnishes such surety bond, if any,

as the Secretary may require and complies with such other reasonable requirements as the Secretary may deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States; and (v) the applicant files with the Secretary a certificate issued by the State official or agency having jurisdiction showing that the old lease was in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the laws of the State issuing it on the applicable date provided for in subsection (a) of this section; or in the absence of such certificate, evidence in the form of affidavit, receipts, canceled checks, and other documents showing such facts.

"(c) In the event any lease covers, as well as other lands, lands of the outer Continental Shelf, the provisions of this section shall apply to such lease insofar only as it covers lands of the outer Continental Shelf.

"Sec. 12. Income from outer Continental Shelf: All rentals, royalties, and other sums payable under any lease on the outer Continental Shelf for the period from June 5, 1950, to date, and thereafter shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

"Sec. 13. Actions involving outer Continental Shelf: Any court proceeding involving a lease or rights under a lease of a portion of the outer Continental Shelf may be instituted in the United States district court for the district in which any defendant may be found or for the district in which the leased property, or some part thereof, is located; or, if no part of the leased property is within any district, for the district nearest to the property involved.

"Sec. 14. Refunds: When it appears to the satisfaction of the Secretary that any person has made a payment to the United States in connection with any lease under this act in excess of the amount he was lawfully required to pay, such excess shall be repaid to such person, his assignees, or his legal representative, if a request for repayment of such excess is filed with the Secretary within 2 years after the issuance of the lease or the making of the payment.

"Sec. 15. Waiver of liability for past operations: (a) No State, or political subdivision, grantee or lessee shall be liable to or required to account to the United States in any way for entering upon, using, exploring for, developing, producing, or disposing of natural resources from lands of the outer Continental Shelf prior to June 5, 1950.

"(b) If it shall be determined by appropriate court action that fraud has been practiced in the obtaining of any lease referred to herein or in the operations thereunder, the waivers provided in this section shall not be effective.

"Sec. 16. Powers reserved to the United States: The United States reserves and retains—

"(a) in time of war or when necessary for national defense, and when so prescribed by the Congress or the President, in addition to any and all other rights it may have under the law, the right (i) of first refusal to purchase all or any portion of the oil or gas that may be produced from the outer Continental Shelf; (ii) to terminate any lease issued or authorized pursuant to or validated by title III of this act, in which event the United States shall become the owner of wells, fixtures, and improvements located on the area of such lease and shall be liable to the lessee for just compensation for such leaseholds, wells, fixtures, and improvements, to be determined as in the case of condemnations; (iii) to suspend operations under any lease issued or authorized pursuant to or validated by title III of this act, in which event the United States shall be liable to the lessee for such compensation as is required to be paid under the Constitution of the United States; and payment of rentals, minimum royalty, and royalty prescribed by such lease shall likewise be suspended during any period of suspension of operations, and

the term of any suspended lease shall be extended by adding thereto any suspension period;

"(b) the right to designate by and through the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President, as areas restricted from the exploration and operation that part of the Continental Shelf needed for national defense; and so long as such designation remains in effect no exploration or operations may be conducted on any part of the surface of such area except with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense; and if operations or production under any lease theretofore issued on lands within any such restricted area shall be suspended, any payment of rentals, minimum royalty, and royalty prescribed by such lease likewise shall be suspended during such period of suspension of operation and production, and the term of such lease shall be extended by adding thereto any such suspension period, and the United States shall be liable to the lessee for such compensation as is required to be paid under the Constitution of the United States; and

"(c) the ownership of and the right to extract helium from all gas produced from the outer Continental Shelf, subject to any lease issued pursuant to or validated by this act under such general rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Secretary, but in the extraction of helium from such gas it shall be so extracted as to cause no substantial delay in the delivery of gas produced to the purchaser of such gas.

"Sec. 17. Geological and geophysical explorations: The right of any person, subject to applicable provisions of law, and of any agency of the United States to conduct geological and geophysical explorations in the outer Continental Shelf, which do not interfere with or endanger actual operations under any lease issued pursuant to this act, is hereby recognized.

"Sec. 18. Interpleader and interim arrangements: (a) Notwithstanding the other provisions of this act, if any lessee under any lease of submerged lands granted by any State, its political subdivisions, or grantees, prior to the effective date of this act, shall file with the Secretary a certificate executed by such lessee under oath and stating that doubt exists (i) as to whether an area covered by such lease lies within the outer Continental Shelf, or (ii) as to whom the rentals, royalties, or other sums payable under such lease are lawfully payable, or (iii) as to the validity of the claims of the State which issued, or whose political subdivision or grantees issued, such lease to the area covered by the lease and that such claims have not been determined by a final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction—

"(1) the lessee may interplead the United States and, with their consent, the State or States concerned, in an action filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and, in the event of State consent to be interpleaded, deposit with the clerk of that court all rentals, royalties, and other sums payable under such lease after filing of such certificate, and such deposit shall be full performance of the lessee's obligation under such lease to make such payments; or

"(2) the lessee may continue to pay all rentals, royalties, and other sums payable under such lease to the State, its political subdivisions, or grantees, as in the lease provided, until it is determined by final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction that such rentals, royalties, and other sums should be paid otherwise, and thereafter such rentals, royalties, and other sums shall be paid by said lessee in accordance with the determination of such final judgment. In the event it shall be determined by such final judgment that the United States is entitled to any moneys theretofore paid to any State

or political subdivision, or grantees thereof, such State, its political subdivision, or grantee, as the case may be, shall promptly account to the United States therefor; and

"(3) the lessee of any such lease may file application for an exchange lease under section 11 hereof at any time prior to the expiration of 6 months after it is determined by final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction that the claims of the State which issued, or whose political subdivision or grantees issued, such lease to the area covered by the lease are invalid as against the United States and that the lands covered by such lease are within the outer Continental Shelf.

"(b) If any area of the outer Continental Shelf or other lands covered by this act included in any lease issued by a State or its political subdivision or grantee is involved in litigation between the United States and such State, its political subdivision, or grantees, the lessee in such lease shall have the right to intervene in such action and deposit with the clerk of the court in which such case is pending any rentals, royalties, and other sums payable under the lease subsequent to the effective date of this act, and such deposit shall be full discharge and acquittance of the lessee for any payment so made.

"TITLE IV

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Sec. 19. Executive Order No. 10426, dated January 16, 1953, entitled 'Setting Aside Submerged Lands of the Continental Shelf as a Naval Petroleum Reserve,' is hereby revoked.

"Sec. 20. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"Sec. 21. Separability: If any provision of this act, or any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or individual word, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of any such provision, section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or individual word to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby; without limiting the generality of the foregoing, if subsection 3 (a) 1, 3 (a) 2, 3 (b) 1, 3 (b) 2, 3 (b) 3, or 3 (c) or any provision of any of those subsections is held invalid, such subsection or provision shall be held separable and the remaining subsections and provisions shall not be affected thereby."

Mr. GRAHAM (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 9, after line 11, insert a new section as follows:

"(k) Nothing contained in this act or any other act shall prevent the leasing of a particular area for oil and gas, and also, at the same time, and for the same area, for sulfur or other minerals, and no person having been granted a lease for any particular mineral shall have any preference right to a lease for any other mineral on account of a discovery of such mineral in the area covered by his lease. No lease shall be for more than one mineral except that 'oil and gas' for the purposes of this act shall be deemed to be one mineral. The Secretary is authorized and when requested by any responsible and qualified person interested in purchasing leases for any mineral other than

oil and gas in any area of the outer Continental Shelf not then under lease for such requested mineral, shall offer for sale in a competitive sealed bidding, mineral leases for a mineral other than oil and gas in such area. The Secretary in his discretion shall fix all proposed terms of any such lease in his invitation to bid, as herein provided, as to royalty rates, area covered and otherwise as circumstances peculiar to development of the undersides area of the Continental Shelf may require: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary shall be and is hereby authorized to promulgate regulations of general application with respect thereto."

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will accept the amendment.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I am addressing myself to an additional aspect of the problem involving the outer Continental Shelf, with particular reference to leaseholds thereon. The language of the pending bill deals only with oil and gas deposits, and to deal with other mineral deposits in the outer Continental Shelf presents no problem. Every Member of this body will be properly concerned with the maximum appropriate utilization of the natural resources to be found in the outer Continental Shelf. We certainly do not wish to place ourselves in the position of seeming to offer protections to oil and gas leaseholds to the exclusion of all other minerals. The State of Texas long since, out of its experience, learned to deal with other possible minerals, for example sulfur; and under its laws, Texas has made possible the exploitation of the same, or substantially the same area for the coincidental development of recovery of oil and gas as well as sulfur.

Those experienced in the field tell me that sulfur occurs in domes which may be 700 to 1,000 feet below the surface. Sulfur may occur in a stratum on the very crest of the dome whereas oil and gas will be found in oil-bearing sands occurring on the flanks of the dome at depths of many thousands of feet below the sulfur-bearing stratum. Oil and gas will be recoverable from the flanges of the dome—not from its crest—and there is no reason whatever why the companies developing and recovering oil and gas resources should not go forward at the same time as those who are seeking to recover sulfur. Completely different processes are involved in the two operations.

What I wish to see Congress do will accomplish the maximum recovery of the natural resources over which we seek to exercise dominion. As the bill now stands there is no provision whatever for recovery of minerals other than oil and gas.

I do not think that this Congress should put itself in the position of legislating only for oil and gas development. Consequently, I feel it to be my duty to alert you to the fact that large and recoverable deposits of sulfur and other minerals are said to occur on the outer Continental Shelf, and while we are legislating on this subject, I think we ought to do a reasonably complete job to stimulate maximum recovery of much needed

minerals in whatever category. Sulfur, particularly, is a strategic and critical material in wartime. American citizens today are exploring for sulfur in various parts of the world, but of course it is sulfur here at home which we need in time of war.

Of course, there are some minerals, like sodium, which it may not be economically feasible to recover by undersea operations. I would not wish to see precluded, however, the possibility of some enterprising development of the recovery of sodium or any other mineral for failure on our part to provide the necessary legislative implementation.

I understand that to explore for and locate sulfur might require vast amounts of capital, perhaps as much as \$10 million and upward, to locate and recover sulfur from a single sulfur dome. I am told that perhaps as many as 20 domes must be drilled in order to find one which is productive, from which it is apparent that this is a highly costly and speculative, exploratory operation.

It seems to me that when Congress is "writing the ticket," and making it possible for some concern to exploit these natural resources under our authority, the very least we should do is insure equal rights to each of various types of prospectors for each of various minerals.

Since the bill as reported by the committee deals simply with oil and gas and makes no provision for the recovery of other minerals, I think Congress should say that nothing contained in this act or any other act shall prevent leasing of a particular area to one person for recovery of oil and gas, and at the same time leasing to others for the recovery of sulfur or other minerals in the same area. I think we should say that no person, having been granted an oil and gas lease, should have any preference right to a lease for sulfur, for example, on account of a discovery of sulfur in an area covered by the oil and gas lease. I think that the Secretary should offer for sale, under separate, competitive, sealed bidding, leases for the recovery of sulfur, or any other mineral, notwithstanding the existence of an outstanding lease for the recovery of oil and gas in the same area. Conversely, I think that the holder of a lease, for the recovery of any particular mineral, should have no preference right to a lease for any other mineral simply because of a discovery of that other mineral in an area covered by his lease.

If the bidding is competitive, every person will have a right to bid. If the bidding is separate, an oil and gas company can bid, just as can a sulfur company. If the bids are sealed, each bidder can be the judge of his own willingness, and to what extent he is ready and able to back up that willingness to seek and recover whatever minerals may be recoverable.

The principle for which I contend is sound. To achieve it, various possible legislative steps are open to us. We can amend the existing bill by a series of amendments to expand the use of the terms "oil and gas" wherever they occur, and otherwise adapting the language to the peculiarities of each of the minerals which might be sought.

I do not recommend that approach for the simple reason that the language of

the bill before us, dealing exclusively with oil and gas, has been carefully worked out and deals adequately with that subject. Let us keep it.

Rather, I think we should interpolate, by way of an amendment, a new section dealing with sulfur and other minerals in a fashion comparable to the way we have dealt with oil and gas.

The correct approach may be stated thus: Let us provide for leases for oil and gas. Let us provide for leases for other minerals, including sulfur. Let us prescribe the appropriate royalty rates which should inure as a result of the discovery and the recovery of one or the other type of mineral. Then let us write one section that applies equally to all which would read, in effect, that nothing contained in this act or any other act shall prevent the leasing to one party of the same area for oil and gas, and also, at the same time, leasing that area to another for sulfur and other minerals, and that no person, having been granted a lease for any particular mineral, shall have any preference right to a lease for any other mineral on account of a discovery of such mineral in the area covered by his lease. Rather, at that point, the Secretary should be required, upon application by any interested bidder, to offer for sale on separate competitive sealed bids, oil and gas leases, sulfur or other mineral leases, on any area or in the same area, of the outer Continental Shelf.

In that way, we will develop to the utmost the natural resources to be found in the outer Continental Shelf. In that way we will secure through competitive bidding an equal opportunity for all, yes, for each to bid for, and recover, any mineral, and avoid future difficulties.

I think we should draw on the experience of the past and deal with this present problem at the very outset.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to see oil and gas leases so drawn as to be exclusive. I wish to see the maximum possible development of our natural resources, and the principle for which I contend can readily be achieved by adopting this amendment. Let us act now, and get off on the right foot as we undertake to deal with the vast outer Continental Shelf.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY: Page 13, line 15, after "1950", insert "Provided however, That all moneys collected by any State through the leasing or disposal of lands or natural resources of the outer Continental Shelf after July 1, 1947, shall be paid to the United States Government except that portion of such moneys which the respective States are obligated to return to lessees."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the language of the amendment which I have offered to the bill now pending is very similar to language contained in section 2 of H. R. 4198 which I expect will be accepted this afternoon. H. R. 4198 provides that the Secretary of the Interior or the Treasurer of the United

States shall be required to pay back to the States any money that the Federal Government has collected through the leasing or other disposal of lands or natural resources within the historic boundaries as defined in the act.

My amendment provides that the States shall reciprocate by paying to the Treasury of the United States any moneys they have collected through the leasing or disposal of natural resources or lands outside the historic boundaries. It seems to me that if the Federal Government is required to pay the States anything it has collected within the historic boundaries, that it is absolutely fair and equitable to provide that the States shall pay to the Federal Government anything they have collected through leasing or other development outside historic boundaries. As a matter of fact, the claim of the Federal Government is much better because its title outside the historic boundaries has not been disputed.

My amendment requires that the States shall return these moneys only if collected after July 1, 1947. That is a date subsequent to the first Supreme Court decision in the California case in which it was decided that the Federal Government had paramount rights not only outside the historic boundaries, now defined, but in the area between these newly defined historic boundaries and the low-water mark adjacent to the shores. It seems to me that the House, and particularly the proponents of titles I and II of this bill, should agree to accept my amendment without objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. It is perfect logic to give to the Federal Government money accruals from submerged lands, which lands, by this bill, we say belong to the Federal Government.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree with the gentleman. It is for that reason I have offered the amendment; that is, to give the House the opportunity to go on record, or at least to make a record of consistency.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Did not the gentleman offer this very same amendment when the bill was being debated on the floor and discussed before?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; this is a different amendment to a different section of the bill. I offered an amendment to title 2 previously.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. But it had the same effect.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; it had a different effect.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I thought it had the same effect.

Mr. McCARTHY. No. The effect in the other case was to provide that the Federal Government should not have to pay what it had collected from the States; just as the States were not required to make repayment to the Federal Government. This requires the

States to make payments similar to those required of the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act, pursuant to House Resolution 233, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 309, nays 91, not voting 31, as follows:

(Roll No. 88)

YEAS—309

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Albert
Alexander
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andresen
August H.
Andrews
Arends
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Barden
Bates
Batlle
Beamer
Becker
Belcher
Bender
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Bentzen
Berry
Betts
Bishop
Bolton
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonin
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Bramblett
Bray
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brownson
Broyhill
Budge
Burlison
Busbey
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Campbell
Carrigg
Cederberg
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chipperfield
Church
Clardy
Clevenger
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Cotton
Coudert
Cretella
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Deane
Derounian
Devereux
Dies
Dodd
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandes
Flno
Fisher
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Gamble
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gentry
George
Golden
Goodwin
Graham
Colmer
Gregory
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Hagen, Minn.
Hale
Haley
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Herlong
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillelson
Hillings
Hinsaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hollfield
Holmes
Holt
Hope
Horan
Hosmer
Hruska
Hunter
Hyde
Ikard
Jackson
James
Jannan
Jenkins
Jensen
Johnson
Jonas, Ill.
Jonas, N. C.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Kilday

King, Calif.
King, Pa.
Knox
Laird
Landrum
Lanham
Lantaff
Latham
LeCompte
Lowe
Lucas
Lyle
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Iowa
Matthews
Meador
Merrill
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Morano
Moss
Moulder
Mumma
Murray
Neal
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
Oakman
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Minn.
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Patterson
Pelly

Perkins
Probst
Philbin
Phillips
Pitcher
Pillon
Poff
Polk
Preston
Priest
Prouty
Rains
Ray
Rayburn
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Rhodes, Ariz.
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Robeson, Va.
Robison, Ky.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Scott
Scrivner
Seudder
Seecrest
Seely-Brown
Seiden
Sheehan
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Shuford
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Small

Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stauffer
Steed
Stringfellow
Taber
Talle
Teague
Thomas
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Walter
Wampler
Warburton
Watts
Welch
Westland
Wharton
Wheeler
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolverton
Yorty
Young
Younger

Mr. Bush for, with Mr. Sieminski against.
Mr. Carlyle for, with Mr. Bailey against.
Mr. Sutton for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gwinn with Mr. Condon.
Mr. Reese of Tennessee with Mr. Dempsey.
Mr. Shafer with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Mason with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.
Mr. Angell with Mr. Smith of Mississippi.
Mr. Hoffman of Michigan with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. PROUTY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. BYRD, CARNAHAN, and CROSSER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DANIEL ROBERT LEARY

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 99 requesting the President of the United States to return a bill which passed both the House and Senate. The child involved in this bill has been taken care of under existing law.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the President of the United States is requested to return to the House the enrolled bill (H. R. 1101) for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing said bill shall be deemed rescinded, and the bill shall be postponed indefinitely.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]?

There was no objection.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER CAMPBELL BROWN

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINE. Admiration for Peter Campbell Brown's qualities as a man, his sagacity as a lawyer, and his fidelity to the public service, all exemplified throughout his chairmanship of the Subversive Activities Control Board, prompts me today, Mr. Speaker, to add my tribute to those already paid him for his achievement in that arduous work, from which he has now resigned.

By diligent inquiry, conducted under his direction, the Board, as we know, has conclusively established that the Communist Party is completely subservient to the evil influences of the Soviet Union, and has thus been able to order the party to submit to registration and control.

The finding as to the party's status, Mr. Speaker, is not, as many have supposed, a mere idle confirmation of the condition long before exposed. When the Board was established, Congress had, indeed, completely uncovered the party's

NAYS—91

Addonizio
Andersen
H. Carl
Aspinall
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brooks, La.
Buchanan
Buckley
Burdick
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Canfield
Cannon
Carnahan
Case
Celler
Chatham
Chudoff
Corbett
Cresser
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Delaney
Dingell
Dollinger
Eberharter
Fine
Fogarty
Forend
Friedel
Garmatz
Gordon
Granahan
Green
Gross
Hébert
Heller
Hesselt
Holtzman
Howell
Javits
Jones, Ala.
Karsten, Mo.
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Lane
Lesinski
Long
McCarthy
McCormack
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Marshall
Miller, Kans.
Mollohan
Morgan
Morrison
Muller
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Passman
Patten
Poage
Powell
Price
Rabaut
Radwan
Reams
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rooney
Roosevelt
Spence
Sullivan
Thompson, La.
Wier
Willis
Withrow
Yates
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—31

Angell
Bailey
Barrett
Boykin
Brown, Ohio
Bush
Carlyle
Condon
Dempsey
D'Ewart
Gwinn
Hart
Hays, Ohio
Hoffman, Mich.
Hull
Krueger
McIntire
McMillan
Mason
Miller, Calif.
Poulson
Reece, Tenn.

So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Barrett against.
Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. Hull against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Hart against.
Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Roberts against.

1953
By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 5195. A bill for the relief of Max Kasher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:
H. R. 5196. A bill for the relief of Serban George Constandaky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5197. A bill for the relief of Iskar Spas Schumanov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5198. A bill for the relief of Zanis Nicls and Lillja Nicls; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5199. A bill for the relief of Gunars Cukurs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5200. A bill for the relief of Abraham Dembitzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5201. A bill for the relief of Leizor and Aron Feldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5202. A bill for the relief of Pavol Jozef Olas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 5203. A bill providing that the title to certain lands within the Stockbridge-Munsee Indian Reservation, Wis., shall be held in trust for the use of the Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Inc., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 5204. A bill for the relief of Antonio Fopp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 5205. A bill for the relief of Imre de Cholnoky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5206. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Cirillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 5207. A bill for the relief of Chin Buck Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 5208. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gluseppina Marinello Pelullo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5209. A bill for the relief of Sante Martinoli, Mrs. Giuditta Martinoli, and Maurizio Martinoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 5210. A bill for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5211. A bill for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5212. A bill for the relief of Jean Rudiano (also known as Ivan Rudenko); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5213. A bill for the relief of Khalid Ahmad Rasheed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 5214. A bill for the relief of Giulio Carone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions, and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

250. By Mr. BEAMER: Petition of 19 persons regarding the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

251. Also, petition of 205 persons regarding the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

252. By Mr. MILLER of New York: Resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Polish-American citizens held at the Polish Home in Lackawanna, N. Y., on Sunday, May 3, 1953, commemorating the 162d anniversary of the

adoption of the Polish Constitution refuting the diplomatic blunders at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam and appealing to Congress to take same determined stand in matters pertaining to Polish cause as did President Eisenhower in his address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in April of 1953, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

253. Also, resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Polish-American citizens held at American Legion Post 1041, in the city of Buffalo, N. Y., on Sunday, May 3, 1953, to take immediate action to revoke the Yalta agreement and refer the case of Poland to the Assembly of the United Nations and to commend and praise President Dwight D. Eisenhower for the just stand he took in his speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors April 16, 1953, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

254. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxillary, Waldwick, N. J., requesting the appropriation of sufficient funds for the Veterans' Administration to reopen all hospital beds, closed during fiscal 1953, and to keep them open and in operation during fiscal 1954; to the Committee on Appropriations.

255. Also, petition of the Society of the Cincinnati, Washington, D. C., endorsing the right and duty of Congress and the judiciary to investigate all Communists and subversive activities and to use every legitimate and constitutional means to drive them out of the Federal, State, and other instrumentalities of Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

256. Also, petition of Hilda Grove and others, of Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447 social-security legislation, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1953

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 12, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, again we turn unfilled to Thee, whose mercies are new every morning and whose love knows no end nor change. Lift the light of Thy countenance upon us, pilgrims, as all our fathers were, and that remembering all the way by which Thou hast led us we may take heart and hope as we face the duties and demands of these days that try men's souls. Preserve us, we pray Thee, from fretfulness and impatience, from depression and anxiety. Increase our faith, strengthen our judgment, quicken our zeal for the things high and holy.

Hear our prayers for a confused and anxious world. Send Thy light into our darkness. Bestow upon the President of the United States and his coadjutors, the Vice President, the Congress, and upon all in every land, who bear rule, special gifts of wisdom and understanding that they may uphold what is right and follow what is true and do their full part toward establishing a world in which the grievous

ills of this time may disappear and a glad day of brotherhood and peace may dawn. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 13, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4198) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to confirm the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the seabed of the Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE CONTINENTAL SHELF—HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 5134, relating to the Continental Shelf, which just came over from the House of Representatives, be retained at the desk and placed on the calendar without reference to committee. The Senate bill has not been actually reported, but it will be reported shortly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. HOEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CLEMENTS was excused from attendance on the sessions

remedial measures was extended by the 81st Congress, with approximately \$25,000 for planning purposes being approved by the 82d Congress, 1st session. These are but preliminary motions, culminating many, many years of deplorable hazard, serious inconvenience and unnecessary damage to property, and there is still no evidence of action, except for the promise of perhaps further planning and study.

Many corrective measures have, at various times, been proposed, and I would assume that the merits of each of these have been fully evaluated as a part of the numerous investigations conducted by the Corps of Engineers and other agencies. From these years of experience, combined with recent developments surrounding comparable problems of flood control, it would also seem that a practical solution for Peace Cross should be near the point of crystallization.

The seriousness of this situation, as it relates to the defense of the Nation's Capital cannot be minimized, and in my opinion, these untenable and recurrent conditions cannot be permitted to continue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Riverdale Citizens Association, Riverdale, Md., relating to this serious problem be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIVERDALE CITIZENS ASSOCIATION,
Riverdale, Md., May 8, 1953.
Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: The Citizens Association of Riverdale, Md., requests that I urge you to convey as strongly as possible to the House Appropriations Committee the urgent need of including in the appropriations the \$1 million necessary for the construction of the Anacostia Flood Control Work.

Their homes and properties are more and more threatened with the increasing flooded conditions now occurring with almost every rain. Flooded cellars, with resulting damage to heating and washing equipment, mildewing of clothes and furniture, breeding ill health conditions, are becoming more and more the common lot of many. Some must wade through water to get to their homes.

We do not believe that this is a new project. Federal funds have been appropriated for surveys, plans and investigations. Furthermore, actual Federal construction has been done on a portion of this project in the dredging and levee work on the lower Anacostia.

After the many years that have been spent in plans, and because the conditions are progressively becoming worse, the citizens are aroused to demanding that relief be now given. The State of Maryland has done its share in passing its State bill No. 583, which the Governor has signed, making it mandatory that \$4,250,000 be spent on the project. But since the United States Army Engineers must supervise the work and furnish the engineering know-how, it is absolutely essential that the Federal Government appropriate construction funds to put the plan into action.

We feel we have a right to expect now of our representatives in the Congress favorable action on the Federal appropriation.

Very truly yours,

WALTER H. GARNER,
President.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1324. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees; without amendment (Rept. No. 270).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1897. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make unfair labor practices of acts and practices by labor unions or employers on grounds of race, religion, color, or national origin; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1898. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Berry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1899. A bill for the relief of certain aliens; and

S. 1900. A bill for the relief of Gertrud Trindler O'Brien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1901. A bill to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1902. A bill for the relief of Theresa Elizabeth Leventer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Taft-Hartley Act by providing that it shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry or for a labor union to engage in analogous practices.

I am a cosponsor, with my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], of a bill which seeks to achieve the same purpose. However, I feel that the bill I am now introducing would achieve this objective in a somewhat more constructive way from the point of view of labor-management relations.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in connection with the bill and the text of the bill itself be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1897) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make un-

fair labor practices of acts and practices by labor unions or employers on grounds of race, religion, color, or national origin, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subsection (a) of section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a semicolon and a new subsection (6), to read as follows:

"(6) To refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a semicolon and a new subsection (7), to read as follows:

"(7) To discriminate against, limit, segregate, or classify any individual so as to affect adversely the employment opportunities or employment status of such individual, or his wages, hours, or conditions of employment, because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry."

The statement by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

I have today introduced a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to make it an unfair labor practice for employers or unions to discriminate against individuals on the basis of "race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry."

As far as unions are concerned the bill would make it an unfair labor practice, subject to cease-and-desist orders and to all the penalties set forth in the Taft-Hartley Act for a union to engage in practices that discriminate, segregate, or classify individuals so as to affect adversely their employment opportunities, employment status, or their wages, hours, or other conditions of work on the basis of race, creed, color, or national ancestry.

My bill, as distinguished from the Ives bill of which I am a cosponsor, would place on employers and unions alike the obligation to refrain from discriminatory practices. My bill would not, however, permit the upsetting of established certification or existing collective bargaining agreement as might be the case under S. 1831.

The provisions of my bill are similar to and are based on the definitions of unfair employment practices which have been included in bills to provide for fair employment practices considered in recent sessions of Congress.

I would, of course, be happy to see enacted any fair and workable amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act to achieve the purpose of preventing discrimination, whether by employers or by unions. I have no special pride of authorship in this proposal. I just want to see the job done. It should be done. It must be done. Employers and unions alike must recognize not only the moral evil but the economic waste involved in discriminatory practices. As far as I am concerned, this is one of the most essential amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act.

DISSOLUTION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BYRD submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 892) to dissolve the Reconstruction

In order to improve and to increase the information activities being done in the field, Civil Air Patrol supplies such tools as copies of national news releases, films, tapes, prepared radio scripts, magazine reprints, and brochures. Elaborate press packets are prepared for distribution prior to the beginning of summer encampments, the international cadet exchange, and anniversary celebrations. Other areas of information liaison are protocol, congressional dinner programing, and speech and media research for the headquarters staff.

Contact, a semimonthly publication, incorporates the Civil Air Patrol newspaper as a regular 4-page insert. This organ of Civil Air Patrol serves as a medium of expression for the national organization and as a means of recognizing singular activities of field units. Editorial content includes staff section coverage, supplemented by news and pictures from the field. Contact is mailed to each active senior member of Civil Air Patrol.

CHAPLAIN

Progress within the Civil Air Patrol chaplaincy is evidenced by such factors as: (1) the increase in number of Civil Air Patrol chaplains, (2) the authorization and assignment of a deputy air chaplain at national headquarters, (3) the organization and initial meeting of the national chaplain's committee, (4) the authorization of regional and deputy regional chaplains and the assignment of 6 of the 8 regional chaplains authorized, (5) the holding of training conferences at regional and wing levels, and (6) publication of the National Air Chaplain Monthly Bulletin forwarded to all Civil Air Patrol chaplains. The chaplaincy continues to impart to Civil Air Patrol a spiritual tone. It makes available to Civil Air Patrol the one profession best qualified to assume the leadership in connection with the moral and citizenship training of the Civil Air Patrol cadets; affords Civil Air Patrol a most convincing talking point for the recruiting of cadets, as it concerns the parents of cadets; and makes available a source of cadets which otherwise would not be available—Sunday schools, church, and youth societies. The chaplaincy associates Civil Air Patrol with the greatest obstacle standing in the path of communism today: religion.

CONCLUSIONS

Civil Air Patrol, in 1952, met to a markedly successful degree, each of its missions as set forth by the Air Force and as established by law. It accomplished this with relatively little expense to the taxpayers and to the Air Force. Civil Air Patrol renders a major contribution in meeting local and national emergencies. It also supports Civil Defense agencies throughout the country. Civil Air Patrol performed 77 percent of the air search and rescue missions within the continental United States, and thereby released United States Air Force Air Rescue Service personnel and planes for other commitments.

The Air Force benefits both directly and indirectly from the training received by members of Civil Air Patrol. This is particularly true in the fields of aviation education, communications, and search and rescue.

The capability of Civil Air Patrol to perform its mission is directly proportionate to the materiel support received from the Air Force and other services and from the contribution of its voluntary members.

Civil Air Patrol is composed of air-minded American citizens who believe in air power, work for air power, and conceive it as both military and civil aviation in all their relationships. Its members are determined to ensure an Air Force capable of guaranteeing our national security.

Civil Air Patrol annual financial statement as of December 31, 1952

RECEIPTS	
Balance Dec. 31, 1951.....	\$31,256.90
Receipts:	
Memberships.....	90,762.00
Prepaid memberships for 1953.....	8,610.00
Insurance refund from cancelled policy.....	1,472.87
Donations.....	3,355.00
Interest on savings accounts.....	400.25
Sale of aircraft.....	250.40
Miscellaneous refunds.....	650.00
Total receipts, 1952.....	136,757.42
DISBURSEMENTS	
Cadet drill competition.....	4,797.10
International Cadet Exchange.....	22,610.38
Official Civil Air Patrol News publication.....	11,945.59
Insurance and bonds.....	12,133.15
National Educational Advisory Committee meetings.....	835.73
Printing and photography.....	3,897.58
Rents.....	192.24
Legal.....	1,001.21
Wing commanders' conference (congressional dinner).....	5,027.33
Petty cash.....	670.80
Miscellaneous.....	2,364.02
Total disbursements, 1952.....	65,475.13
Total receipts.....	136,757.42
Less disbursements.....	65,475.13
	71,282.29
Savings funds on deposit.....	50,936.66
Balance, Dec. 31, 1952.....	122,218.95

HOMETOWN WELFARE?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the newest member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet, the distinguished Mrs. Oveta Hobby, made a statement to the effect that more of our welfare work should be done by the people themselves at the local level of government. She stated: "A tax dollar that goes to Washington never comes back intact."

In this connection, the Pittsburgh Press of yesterday commented favorably on the statement of Mrs. Hobby, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the editorial printed by the Pittsburgh Press entitled "Hometown Welfare?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOMETOWN WELFARE?

The interesting suggestion that welfare programs might cost less if they were financed locally is raised by Mrs. Oveta Hobby, the new Cabinet member who administers welfare activities.

Our welfare programs do cost a good deal, even though they are not as elaborate as those in some other countries where everyone is entitled to free medical care and where governments encourage overpopulation by monthly allowances for each child in a family.

But government programs have a tendency to grow and to cost more and more as the years go by.

In these times of full employment the people in the individual States and cities might well ask themselves whether they wouldn't be better off—financially as well as morally—to handle and pay for their welfare programs themselves and look to the Federal Government only in cases of grave emergency.

Despite the pleasant self-deception involved in accepting handouts from Washington, the taxpayers must pay for them anyway, and, as Mrs. Hobby so succinctly puts it, "a tax dollar that goes to Washington never comes back intact."

THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF AND ITS DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been conducting hearings on Senate bill 1901, dealing with the outer Continental Shelf and its development.

Because I have pending before the mittie amendments pertaining to this subject and to the revenues to be derived, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who is an outstanding authority on this subject, courteously invited me to submit a statement on this vital matter.

I fear that we have heard too little concerning the disposition of this great area, seaward of the States' historic boundaries, wherein is located the great bulk of our offshore oil resources.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent that my statement, in the form of a letter to the senior Senator from Oregon be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 26, 1953.

Hon. GUY CORDON,

Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GUY: I want to tell you how very much I appreciate your kind suggestion that I submit a statement to your distinguished Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs relative to pending legislation dealing with development of the outer Continental Shelf. Perhaps you would offer this letter outlining my views for the record being built by your committee.

You will recall that my amendments, submitted to the committee some time ago, dealt with this very problem of the outer shelf. I recollect, with appreciation, your own kind remarks on the floor of the Senate wherein you pointed out that the essentials of my amendments, and Senator ANDERSON's amendments as they pertained to the outer shelf, were the basis for Senate bill 1901, now pending before the committee.

As the Senator knows, I do not believe that big government—a big Federal Government—should come along after 160 years of legal lethargy and tell any State that it does not own its own property. For that reason, I supported Senate Joint Resolution 13, vesting State title to the submerged lands within the historic boundaries of those States.

However, when Senate Joint Resolution 13 merely confirmed jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries, it seemed to me that the resolution did not go far enough.

My amendments, you will recall, do two things: First, they give to the Federal Government exclusive development rights in this outer-shelf area beyond historic State boundaries.

I emphasize my belief that Federal law should pertain in this area. In my view, there are no valid State claims there, and that to extend State jurisdiction—be it through State conservation laws or taxation prerogatives or other forms of State control—is an inconsistent and unworkable approach.

If the outer shelf is to be confirmed for the Federal Government, it should be without attendant strings attached.

I saw no reason why the Federal Government should participate in the development of those offshore lands within historic State boundaries. I see no reason why the coastal States should have any jurisdiction within the federally controlled areas seaward of these boundaries.

My amendments would also disburse the revenues derived from the resources lying to the edge of the shelf, for educational purposes.

The aid-to-education proposal which I have suggested to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs varies from that offered in the past by my distinguished colleague from Alabama, Mr. HILL.

In my opinion, this step would both solve the controversial question of Federal aid to education, and also would bestow the fruits from an area of Federal resources upon the needy school systems of all our States and Territories. In the case of the amendments which I have proposed, the funds derived from the rich seabeds of the Continental Shelf are clearly Federal funds, unclouded by the proposition that it is State resources which we would be asked to disburse to the Nation as a whole.

My amendments go a step further by spelling out a simple formula for disbursement of these funds to primary, secondary, and higher educational facilities within the States. Under this simplified formula, the old bugaboo of Federal aid to education will not sully the purpose of assisting our sorely pressed school systems. My proposal would transfer the funds derived from these resources to the school systems on the basis of school population alone.

There is no issue of Federal control and dictation herein involved. There is no rigid formula of aid to education whereby the Government in Washington lays down the law in a province traditionally reserved to the States, and forces school systems to line up their budgets and their State constitutions as well in order to qualify for assistance.

In my own State of New Jersey, all moneys arising from the sale of riparian rights are dedicated to the school fund of the State and cannot be used for any other purpose. My suggestions represent what I deem to be a practical and sensible approach to the disbursement of Federal funds derived from our natural resources. Those funds would go where they would do a great good for a growing and deep-seated problem of our times, without stirring up the rancors consistent with heavy handed Federal control.

Estimates to date indicate that from 70 to 90 percent of offshore wealth are located in that area of the Continental Shelf which appertains along its seabed to the Federal Government.

I realize that claims are being made for State participation in this outer Shelf region. I must oppose these claims.

Again, I am most grateful for your consideration and kindness in soliciting my views for your record. Naturally, I hope that they will be incorporated in the measure reported to the Senate.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON.

DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION IN CAPITALS OF UKRAINE AND BYELORUSSIA—LETTER OF UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, BISMARCK, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from the North Dakota State Branch of Ukrainian Con-

gress Committee of America, Bismarck, N. Dak., signed by Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, president, concerning the establishment of American diplomatic representation in the capitals of Ukraine and Byelorussia. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD, including the names of the officers of the committee, a group of outstanding and distinguished citizens of our country.

There being no objection, the letter, including the names of the officers, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
STATE BRANCH OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck, N. Dak., April 27, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The North Dakota State Branch of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is vitally interested in the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution No. 58 concerning the establishment of American diplomatic representation in the capitals of Ukraine and Byelorussia.

We believe this would be an excellent move on the part of the United States in its psychological strategy because it would (1) cause concern in the Kremlin over America's interest in these two vital areas of the Soviet Union; (2) enhance the meaning of our counter-Soviet propaganda; (3) expose the Soviet's fraudulent claims of the independence of the republics; (4) tighten the bonds of alliance which the Ukrainians and Byelorussians naturally feel with America and the West; (5) cause embarrassment to the puppet delegations now falsely representing the Ukrainian and Byelorussian people in the United Nations; (6) be a valid test of the Soviet Union's current manifestations of a desire for peace and friendly relations; (7) gain for the United States additional listening posts behind the Iron Curtain, and open possibilities for contact with active anti-Soviet national leaders.

We respectfully urge you to support this resolution in the interest of America's gaining the initiative in the crucial area of psychological strategy and exposing the camouflaged imperialistic acts of the Soviet Union toward the captive peoples and satellite nations.

Respectfully yours,

Dr. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, UCCA State Branch of
North Dakota.

Vice presidents: Steve Hlebichuck, Bismarck, N. Dak.; Irene Hordynsky, Drake, N. Dak.; Alex Chorny, Wilton, N. Dak.

Secretary: William Sawycky, Wilton, N. Dak.

Treasurer: William Melnik, Beach, N. Dak.

Board members: Nick Chernos, Wilton, N. Dak.; John Kytlor, Dickinson, N. Dak.; Peter Iwanliw, Riverdale, N. Dak.

Advisory board: Dr. Bohdan Hordynsky, Drake, N. Dak.; Irene Mychajluk, Enderlin, N. Dak.; Nick Prokop, Belfield, N. Dak.; Katherine Melnik, Beach, N. Dak.; Dmytro Sawycky, Wilton, N. Dak.; Nick Sologuk, Wilton, N. Dak.

WHEAT FOR PAKISTAN

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Congress is being urged to act immediately on a request for the shipment of 37.5 million bushels of wheat to Pakistan.

Yesterday at a radio forum, Harold Stassen, Director of the Mutual Security Agency, stated that a committee from the State Department had made a thor-

ough study of this famine-stricken country and the need for this food.

Governor Stassen stated that it was his firm conviction that the shipment of this amount of food to Pakistan would not only stabilize the present Government, which is friendly to us, but would mean much to our future relations in that entire section of Asia.

We shall have, on July 1, a carryover of some 550 million bushels of wheat. Therefore, wheat is one commodity we can ship without in any way damaging our reserve.

Let me respectfully suggest that—

First. The Senate take early action on this request.

Second. Every effort be made to get some of this grain to Pakistan by August 1, for I am advised that arrival of the wheat at that time would be most helpful.

Third. A percentage of it be shipped in the form of flour, in order that this foodstuff may be ready for immediate use.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of the letter I have written to Governor Stassen.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 1, 1953.

Hon. HAROLD STASSEN,
Director, Mutual Security Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR STASSEN: After listening last Sunday to your splendid statement regarding your trip to the Far East, your statement in regard to the famine conditions in Pakistan, and the benefits to be derived from the shipment of foodstuffs, I am urging immediate action in the Senate in order that we may have the full benefit from the shipment of this grain.

As I understand it, the National Security Council is making a study of this request and I sincerely trust they will make their recommendations at an early date.

We have a surplus of wheat in this Nation and the shipment of wheat and flour from our reserves would not in any way endanger our own food supply.

I would recommend that a portion of this shipment be in the form of flour, in order that it would be ready for immediate use on arrival.

If I can be of further assistance in this matter, kindly let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK CARLSON.

EXEMPTION FROM ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE ACT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4654) to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes, and asking a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the conference

made a part of my remarks and printed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

When the American people went to the polls last fall, it seems unlikely that very many of them voted to turn this Government over to the financial operators on the Federal Reserve Board. Recently, in a hearing before the House Banking Committee, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas required Federal Reserve Board Chairman William Martin to furnish the committee with the banking connections of some key Government figures. That reveals that R. B. Anderson, Secretary of the Navy, was a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas at the time of his appointment; Budget Director Joseph Dodge was in the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago; Under Secretary of the Treasury Folsom was with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York; Dr. John Hannah, Assistant Secretary of Defense, was with the Federal Reserve Bank of Detroit; Comptroller of the Currency Ray Gidney was president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland; W. I. Myers, now Chairman of the National Agricultural Advisory Committee was with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York; Secretary of the Navy Robert Stevens came from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York; as did Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. And Mr. Randolph Burgess, the architect of the interest rate hikes now being instituted, was a director of the Federal Reserve Bank in New York at the time he came to Washington.

The American people are becoming aware of the real meaning of the financial maneuvers that are going on; the mail to the Senators and Congressmen shows that clearly enough. With the key Government positions being held by bankers, it should surprise no one to see them following a policy that will pour billions of dollars a year into the pockets of other bankers. In brief: This has become a Government of the bankers, by the bankers, and for the bankers.

AMENDMENT TO THE NATURAL GAS ACT—RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSIONER OF OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution relating to House bills 3769 and 3892, which resolution was sent to me by the public-utilities commissioner of Oregon.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas H. R. 3769 and H. R. 3892 (introduced by Congressman HINSHAW, of California, and Congressman HARRIS, of Arkansas, respectively) are now pending in the 83d Congress, first session; and

Whereas such bills would amend the Natural Gas Act by creating a new subsection (c) to section 1 thereof, as follows:

"(c) The provisions of this act shall not apply to any person engaged in or legally authorized to engage in the transportation in interstate commerce, or to the sale in interstate commerce for resale, of natural gas received by such person within or at the boundary of a State and ultimately consumed within such State, or to any facilities used by such person for such transportation or sale, provided such person and operation be subject to regulation by a State commission or other legally constituted local public authority. The matters exempted from the provisions of this act by this subsection are hereby declared to be matters primarily of

local concern and subject to regulation by the several States"; and

Whereas the enactment of such legislation would benefit State jurisdiction and would not materially affect Federal jurisdiction; and

Whereas the several States are able to regulate the matters and things contained in said proposed legislation and the adoption of said proposal appears to be in the public interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the public utilities commissioner of the State of Oregon urges that Congress of the United States to enact said proposed legislation into law.

Signed this 20th day of May 1953.

CHARLES H. HELTUL,
Public Utilities Commissioner of Oregon.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further business to come before the Senate, without objection, and under the order previously entered, the Senate will stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 2, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 1 (legislative day of May 28), 1953:

UNITED NATIONS

Mason Sears, of Massachusetts, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL

John C. Hughes, of New York, to be the United States permanent representative on the North Atlantic Council, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Raymond Henry Fogler, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 1 (legislative day of May 28), 1953:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Joseph E. Talbot, of Connecticut, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1959. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Darrell O. Holmes to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Carl F. White to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 27, with headquarters at Los Angeles, Calif.

Charles F. Brown, Jr. to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky.

Cleta M. Smith to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 45, with headquarters at St. Louis, Mo.

Chester R. MacPhee, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 28, with headquarters at San Francisco, Calif.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 1, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order, by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ARENDT.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast called us to serve our generation in these days of crisis and darkness grant that we may be men and women of spiritual vision, of strong moral character, and of clear-seeing practical wisdom.

We pray that we may eagerly embrace every opportunity we have of assisting mankind find in life its majestic meanings, its lofty purposes, and its enduring satisfactions.

Show us how we may minister more helpfully to all the people of the earth as they look wistfully for a light to illumine the skyline of their hopes and aspirations.

May we be guided by Thy divine spirit in achieving the cooperation of men and nations everywhere in the great task of building a better world.

Grant that no divergency of material interests may break that unity of spirit that we so sorely need as we strive for those blessings of peace and prosperity which none can ever find and enjoy alone.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 28, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 21, 1953:

H. R. 2277. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4465. An act to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended.

On May 22, 1953:

H. R. 4198. An act to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to confirm the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the seabed of the Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries.

On May 27, 1953:

H. R. 2420. An act for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk; and

H. R. 3389. An act for the relief of Pio Valensin.

On May 29, 1953:

H. R. 782. An act for the relief of Kurt J. Hain and Arthur Karge;

H. R. 1563. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain unnegotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon

"Sec. 1042. Unless otherwise directed by the court, all notices required by this chapter may be given by mail to the parties entitled thereto to their addresses ascertained in the manner prescribed for other notices in section 58 of this act.

"Sec. 1043. A previous discharge of a debtor or confirmation of an arrangement under other provisions of this act shall not be ground for denying him the benefits of this chapter.

"Sec. 1044. No income or profit, taxable under any law of the United States or of any State now in force or which may hereafter be enacted shall, in respect to the adjustment of the indebtedness of a debtor in a proceeding under this chapter, be deemed to have accrued to or to have been realized by a debtor by reason of a modification in or cancellation in whole or in part of any such indebtedness in a proceeding under this chapter: *Provided, however,* That if it shall be made to appear that the proceeding had for one of its principal purposes the evasion of any income tax, the exemption provided by this section shall be disallowed.

"Sec. 1045. Until the Supreme Court of the United States has promulgated general orders and official forms governing this chapter, general order 50, and the official forms heretofore made shall, insofar as not inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this chapter, be applicable to procedure under this chapter.

"ARTICLE XIV—EFFECT OF CHAPTER

"Sec. 1051. A petition may be filed under this chapter in a proceeding in bankruptcy which is pending on the effective date of this amendatory act, and a petition may be filed under this chapter notwithstanding the pendency on such date of a proceeding in which a receiver or trustee of all or any part of the property of a debtor has been appointed or for whose appointment application has been made in a court of the United States or of any State.

"Sec. 1052. As of the day preceding the date on which the provisions of this amendatory act become effective, an allocation shall be made by the judge or judges of the several courts of bankruptcy of all filing and other fees, commissions, and allowances, and of all expense funds, due the then existing conciliation commissioners for services rendered and expenses incurred in the cases pending before them, whether as referee or conciliation commissioner under this act. The balances of such filing and other fees, commissions, and allowances, and the expense surpluses shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States by the conciliation commissioners and the clerks, to be deposited to the credit of the respective salary and expense funds as provided in paragraph (4) of subdivision c of section 40 of this act. All cases then pending before conciliation commissioners shall be referred, and no additional filing fees shall be required, but additional salary and expense charges may be assessed in such cases in such amounts as the judge or judges of the several courts of bankruptcy may deem equitable, taking into consideration the provisions of this chapter.

"Sec. 1053. The provisions of section 75, as amended, of the act entitled 'An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States,' approved July 1, 1898, shall continue in full force and effect with respect to proceedings pending under that section upon the effective date of this amendatory act: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this amendatory act shall govern in such proceedings so far as practicable."

Sec. 2. Clause (2) of section 35 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) not holding any office of profit or emolument under the laws of the United States or of any State or subdivision thereof other than special master under this act: *Provided, however,* That part-time referees may be commissioners of deeds, United

States commissioners, justices of the peace, masters in chancery, notaries public, or retired officers and retired enlisted personnel of the Regular and Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, members of the National Guard of the United States, and of the National Guard of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, except the National Guard disbursing officers who are on a full-time salary basis;"

Sec. 3. (a) Paragraph (4) of subdivision c of section 40 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(4) A referees' salary fund and a referees' expense fund shall be established in the Treasury of the United States, and the amounts of the various fees and allowances collected by the clerks for the services of referees and for their expenses, including the fees, allowances, and charges for their services and expenses as special masters under this act, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States for the account of such salary fund and expense fund. The salaries of the referees in active service shall be paid out of annual appropriations from such salary fund, and the expenses of referees, including the salaries of their clerical assistants, shall be paid out of annual appropriations from such expense fund, by the United States. Any deficiencies of such salary fund or expense fund shall be paid out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, and appropriations to pay such deficiencies are hereby authorized: *Provided, however,* That there shall be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury of the United States in any subsequent year so much of the surplus, if any, arising in the salary fund or expense fund, respectively, as may be necessary to reimburse the Treasury of the United States for payments made on account of such respective funds in any prior year."

(b) Paragraph (2) of subdivision d of section 40 as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Any referee who has retired or been retired under the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subdivision d may, if called upon by a judge of a court of bankruptcy, perform, without compensation, such duties of a referee or special master under this act, within the jurisdiction of such court, as such referee may be able and willing to undertake: *Provided, however,* That when so acting, compensation for his services shall be allowed and paid or deposited and his expenses shall be allowed and paid, as in the case of an active referee."

Sec. 4. Clause (2) of section 51 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) collect the fees of the clerk and trustee and the fees for the referees' salary fund and referees' expense fund provided in paragraph (1) of subdivision c of section 40 of this act in each case instituted before filing the petition, except where installment payments may be authorized pursuant to section 40 of this act, and collect the various other fees, allowances, and charges for the services of referees and for their expenses, including their services and expenses as special masters under this act."

Sec. 5. Section 72 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 72. Limitation of compensation of officers of court: No receiver, marshal, or trustee shall in any form or guise receive, nor shall the court allow him, any other or further compensation for his services as required by this act, than that expressly authorized and prescribed in this act.

"No referee shall receive any compensation for his services under this act other than his salary; and allowances made to a referee for compensation or expense while acting as a referee or special master under any chapter or section of this act, shall be paid to the clerk, and by him transmitted to the Treasury of the United States for deposit in the

referees' salary fund and referees' expense fund, respectively."

Sec. 6. (a) If any provision of this amendatory act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this amendatory act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this amendatory act are declared to be severable.

(b) Article and section headings shall not be taken to govern or limit the scope of the articles or sections to which they relate.

(c) Nothing herein contained shall have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty forfeiture, or liability incurred under any act or acts of which this act is amendatory.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GORE. I ask that the bill go over. I have had no opportunity to study the amendments. This is a far-reaching bill, and I ask that it go over in order that I may have an opportunity to give some consideration to the effect of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

Mr. GORE subsequently said: Mr. President, some time ago, when Senate bill 25, Calendar No. 270, was called I interposed objection to the consideration and passage of the bill. I did so because I had not had an opportunity to consider the amendments which were read and adopted to the bill.

Since then, and during the colloquy which has occurred on the floor, I have had an opportunity to examine the amendments and to discuss the bill with the member of the Judiciary Committee who reported it. Therefore I wish to withdraw my objection, and I desire to ask that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar, to be called later today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. LONG. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

REGULATION OF LIFE INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—BILL PASSED TO NEXT CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The bill (S. 879) to amend section 12 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, as amended, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection, so that I may ask for an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the bill proposes to modernize the insurance laws of the District of Columbia affecting accident and health insurance, so as to bring them into line with the practice followed in 27 States which now have such laws in effect. The bill would give to policyholders here the benefits which

for the TVA for the fiscal year 1954 should not be curtailed.

Adopted in St. Paul, Minn., this 8th day of June 1953.

MINNESOTA RAILROAD AND WAREHOUSE COMMISSION,

PAUL A. RASMUSSEN, Chairman.
CLIFFORD C. PETERSON.

Commissioner Ewald W. Lund dissenting.

REPEAL OF FEDERAL ADMISSION TAX—RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH CENTRAL ALLIED INDEPENDENT THEATER OWNERS, INC., MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted at a recent convention of the North Central Allied Independent Theater Owners, Inc., held in Minneapolis, Minn., relating to the repeal of the 20 percent Federal admission tax be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas all Senators and Representatives from North and South Dakota, both Senators from Minnesota, and 7 of its 9 Congressmen have pledged themselves to fight and vote for repeal of the obnoxious and discriminatory 20 percent Federal admission tax and,

Whereas all Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States in this territory have shown full understanding of and great sympathy with the plight of the independent theater owners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Central Allied Independent Theater Owners, Inc., and their guests from the ranks of distribution, in convention assembled in the city of Minneapolis this 5th day of May 1953, That the proper officers are hereby authorized and instructed to extend to these cooperating and understanding Senators and Representatives, the sincere thanks of the motion picture industry in this territory and call upon them to continue their good work until the fight is won, and that our particular gratitude be extended to JOHN BLATNIK, Eighth Minnesota District, HAROLD HAGEN, Ninth Minnesota District, ROY WIER, Third Minnesota District, and to any other Members of Congress who may have done likewise, for their sacrifice of time and showing of interest in making personal appearances in our behalf before the House Ways and Means Committee.

Whereas Minnesota Senator, EDWARD J. THYE, is Chairman of the United States Senate Small Business Committee, and Minnesota Senator, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, is a member of that committee; and

Whereas both of these outstanding lawmakers have long taken a personal interest in the problems of the independent motion picture theater owners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Central Allied Independent Theaters Owners, Inc., in convention assembled in the city of Minneapolis this 5th day of May 1953, That the President and Executive Counsel are hereby authorized and instructed to address Senators THYE and HUMPHREY, urging them to take personal interest in the work of the committee in connection with the problems of independent motion picture exhibitors and to do all in their power, by way of recommendation of suitable legislation or otherwise, to relieve the exhibitors of the onerous, oppressive and unlawful practices featured in the testimony before the committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1684. A bill to facilitate civil-service appointment of persons who lost opportunity therefor because of service in the Armed Forces after June 30, 1950, and to provide certain benefits upon appointment; with amendments (Rept. No. 405).

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1237. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 407);

H. R. 2313. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of March 27, 1942, as extended, relating to the inspection and audit of plants, books, and records of defense contractors, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter; without amendment (Rept. No. 408); and

H. R. 3853. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950; with amendments (Rept. No. 409).

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1901. A bill to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 411).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 144. A bill for the relief of the Cavalier County Fair Association (Rept. No. 413);

S. 296. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Henry Litmanowitz (Litman) (Rept. No. 414);

S. 385. A bill for the relief of Anna Solenianl (Rept. No. 415);

S. 508. A bill for the relief of Alfred Theodor Ex (Rept. No. 416);

S. 559. A bill for the relief of Edward Joseph Wentforth (Rept. No. 417);

S. 561. A bill for the relief of Charles Chardon Brooks (Rept. No. 418);

S. 648. A bill for the relief of Damiano Mario Carmine Palusci (Rept. No. 419);

S. 722. A bill for the relief of Mary Beth Hines (Rept. No. 420);

S. 1016. A bill for the relief of Josephine Schaitel (Rept. No. 421);

S. 1363. A bill for the relief of Eddie L. Bennett, Jr. (Joji Chitose) (Rept. No. 422);

S. 1366. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Montero (Rept. No. 423);

S. 1380. A bill for the relief of Simonella Evonne Magliulo (Rept. No. 424);

S. 1432. A bill for the relief of Peter Penovic, Milos Grahovac, and Nikola Maljkovic (Rept. No. 425);

S. 1443. A bill for the Jose Deang (Rept. No. 426);

S. 1467. A bill for the relief of Patrick Devine (Rept. No. 427);

S. 1659. A bill for the relief of Antony Timothe Fairchild (Ishida Makoto) and Marie Dolores Fairchild (Shimizu Reiko) (Rept. No. 428);

S. 1701. A bill for the relief of Paul Stanley Blow (Paul Stanley Matsumura) (Rept. No. 429);

S. 1705. A bill for the relief of William Lance McKinley (Biro Takedo) (Rept. No. 430);

S. 1758. A bill for the relief of Cathalina Furukawa (Rept. No. 431);

S. 1791. A bill for the relief of Leong Walk Hong (Rept. No. 432);

H. R. 2201. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Tzortzis (Rept. No. 433); and

H. R. 5238. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Jarecki (Rept. No. 434).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 381. A bill for the relief of Donald Grant (Rept. No. 435);

S. 551. A bill for the relief of Mamertas Cvirka and Mrs. Petronele Cvirka (Rept. No. 436);

S. 730. A bill for the relief of Winfried Kohls (Rept. No. 437); and

S. 973. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jawad Hedayaty (Rept. No. 438).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 247. A bill for the relief of Frans Gunnick (Rept. No. 439).

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (REPT. NO. 412)

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably with amendments, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements, including the minority views of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the individual views of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and printed, including the minority views and individual views, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

IMPORTATION OF FEED WHEAT FROM CANADA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 410)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I desire to submit a report on the investigation of the importation of feed wheat from Canada. The investigation was based on a report which was made to the Congress by the Comptroller General last December, and which indicated that there had been violations of certain provisions of the law, possibly criminal violations. The Committee on Agriculture has conducted an investigation and has held two or three hearings. I therefore submit the report on those hearings, as conducted to this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and printed.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 440) thereon.

present, I had stated that it was my desire to move that calendar No. 441, S. 1901, to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes, be made the unfinished business.

If that is done, I then propose to move that the Senate take a recess until Thursday. On Thursday it is proposed to have a call of the calendar. It will not be our purpose to take action upon the proposed submerged lands legislation until proper opportunity has been afforded to consider it. I hope that the printing of the hearings can be expedited. If they should be ready by Friday, I hope that we may get started on the debate. I am sure the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and other Senators would like to discuss the question. It will not be my purpose to move for a vote on the bill without affording Senators an opportunity to examine the record.

At any rate, we hope to be prepared early next week to begin the discussion of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the distinguished acting majority leader give us assurance that there will be no votes until next week?

Mr. KNOWLAND. So far as the majority leader is concerned—and I am sure there will be no effort on the part of the chairman of the subcommittee to seek a vote before next week—there will be no votes on this proposed legislation prior to next week. However, I hope, if the printed reports are available, that we may get started on the debate on Friday.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator well knows, since I am from Louisiana, I am vitally interested in this proposed legislation. As the Senator also knows, I have been very busy in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is a very able and conscientious member of that committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not had an opportunity to study the evidence or to hear any of the evidence. It is my hope that time will be allowed so that I may at least look over the evidence, study the report, and be prepared to discuss the bill next week.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that I am informed that galley proofs of the hearings are available. I am sure that if the Senator desires a copy the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] will see that it is made available.

I will give the assurances which the Senator has just asked for, that we will not proceed to a vote prior to next week.

Mr. ELLENDER. What I intend to do is to spend the weekend in reviewing the evidence. In the meantime, I hope to assist in concluding the markup of several appropriation bills now being considered by the Committee on Appropriations. I understand that on Thursday the full committee intends to complete marking up the Interior Department bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. One reason why I am proposing that the Senate take a recess from tonight until Thursday is to give a number of committees which have been trying to operate with Senators rushing back and forth between the Chamber and the committee rooms an opportunity to do some work without having to go through that process. The Senator from Louisiana, who is a member of the Civil Functions Subcommittee, of which I happen to be chairman, knows that in order to accomplish something in that subcommittee and to avoid the constant moving in and out of the committee room we started a meeting at 7:30 o'clock last night and continued until about 10:30. I think the various committees could well use some uninterrupted time to move the legislative program along.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator may rest assured that the acting majority leader will always be glad to cooperate with Senators on both sides of the aisle in any reasonable arrangement. I had been informed that certain Senators from States which are also vitally interested had commitments the following weekend and that they hoped the bill would be out of the way by that time. So I am trying to accommodate both the Senator from Louisiana and other Senators who have an equal interest.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1901, Calendar 441.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments.

Mr. COOPER subsequently said: Mr. President, what is the situation with respect to Senate bill 1901?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Kentucky was probably not in the Chamber at the time that bill was made the unfinished business. It is my intention to move that the Senate take a recess until Thursday. On Thursday we shall have a call of the calendar. There will be no voting in connection with the unfinished business until next week. I hope that if the printed record is available we shall be prepared to begin the debate on Friday. However, if the printed record is not available, we shall not begin the debate until Monday, in

which case we shall substitute something else on Friday.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND NOMINATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives during the recess of the Senate; also to receive nominations from the executive branch of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING RECESS OF THE SENATE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign enrolled bills during the recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO SUBMIT REPORTS ON BILLS AND NOMINATIONS DURING THE RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committees be authorized to submit reports on bills and nominations during the recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, June 18, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 16 (legislative day of June 8), 1953:

UNITED NATIONS

John C. Baker, of Ohio, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 16th session of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James S. Kemper, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

L. Corrin Strong, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

M. Robert Guggenheim, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

BUREAU OF THE MINT

Ross P. Buell, of California, to be superintendent of the mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, which were, on page 1, strike out lines 7 and 8, inclusive; on page 1, strike out line 11; on page 32, strike out line 18; on page 38, strike out lines 11 and 12; on page 41, strike out line 5; and on page 66, after line 2, insert:

A-7824615, Ackermann, Carolina McDowell or Carolina Peralta or Carolina Peralta McDowell or Carolina McDowell.

A-3261193, Atteyeh, Zahla Najm or Victoria Atteyeh.

A-1110134, Parada, Emil Fernandez or Emil Fernandez.

A-5890316, Johnson, Mildred Louise or Mildred Louise Stroman.

A-7145947, Robinson, Alleyne.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, which expresses congressional approval of the adjustment of status of certain cases of suspension of deportation pursuant to section 19 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1927, was agreed to by the Senate on May 6, 1953.

The House of Representatives amended the concurrent resolution on June 16, 1953, by making certain technical changes, chiefly with reference to the spelling of names of certain aliens embraced in the concurrent resolution.

Accordingly I move that the Senate agree to the House amendments to Senate Concurrent Resolution 25. In support of that motion I may say that I believe the House has made a further study of the names and has found that there were certain corrections to be made, and has made them. That is why the Senate should concur in the amendments of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah.

The motion was agreed to.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes.

UNITED STATES SUPPORT PRICE ON COTTONSEED

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to what I consider to be a very important subject. I believe the Senators should be informed of the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture issued an order today to reduce the support price on cottonseed to 75 percent of parity. I predicted some time ago that this would happen and it would be the beginning of the end for the farmers. The base-support price for the 1953 crop was set at \$54.54 a ton, as compared with last year's \$66.40. It is a difference of \$12 a ton for grade 100 cottonseed. I warn the wheat producers and the corn growers and the other segments of the agricultural population that this is only the beginning of the reductions.

Oh yes, we have 90 percent of parity on some selected commodities. Yet the President of the United States, when he was a candidate for office, ran on a program of 100 percent of parity, and promised that the farmer would be protected in the same way the laborer is protected. I do not know whether the President of the United States had anything to do with this reduction, but he appointed the Secretary of Agriculture who says we do not want the 100 percent of parity the President recommended in his campaign speeches. He says we do not want 90 percent, which is the law, but that we will have 75 percent on cottonseed.

Of course, 90 percent parity may apply on butter, and on some other commodities, but I warn now—and I believe it to be my duty to do so, because I have been following agricultural subjects as a member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations—that wheat, corn, pork, and the other commodities will suffer the same reductions. Such a reduction, plus 2 percent interest is rather rough on the boy who lives on the country farm and who works from sunup to sundown and who in my humble judgment is the backbone of the country.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the New York Times printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SUPPORT PRICE ON COTTONSEED CUT—LEVEL REDUCED TO \$54.50 A TON COMPARED WITH \$66.40 SET FOR GRADE 100 YEAR AGO—OUT TO BAR ACCUMULATION—NEW RATE DESIGNED TO REFLECT 75 PERCENT OF PARITY AGAINST 90 IN EFFECT LAST YEAR

WASHINGTON, June 21.—The Department of Agriculture announced today a reduction in support prices for cottonseed in a move aimed at halting heavy accumulation of supplies by the Government.

The base support price for the 1953 crop was set at \$54.50 a ton compared with last year's \$66.40 for grade 100 cottonseed. The new rate is designed to reflect 75 percent of parity compared with last year's 90 percent. Parity is a standard designed to be fair to farmers in relation to prices they pay.

ACTS TO SPUR COMPETITION

The Department said the new rates should make cottonseed products—such as oil, meal and linters—competitive in commercial markets with products of other oilseeds,

such as soybeans, peanuts and flaxseed as well as imported vegetable oils.

Vegetable oils are used in making margarine, salad dressings and shortening. Meals are used in livestock feeds, and linters are used in making synthetic fibers and ammunition.

Officials said that because other oilseed products have been lower than those set for cottonseed products by last year's support program, more than one-half of last year's cottonseed crop has been turned over to the Department under the support program for want of markets.

SUPPORT PLAN OUTLINED

As in the past, prices will be supported by means of loans on farm-stored cottonseed and purchases of cottonseed and cottonseed products. In areas where it is not feasible to store the crop on the farm, the Department will buy at \$50.50 a ton.

Other provisions of the support program, including purchase prices for cottonseed products, are being developed and will be announced later, the Department said. Officials indicated they would be little if any different from the 1952 program.

The Government's holdings of cottonseed oil are large enough, officials said, to make more than a year's supply of margarine.

PROTEST OF CONVICTION OF LABOR LEADER, JACK HALL, IN HONOLULU

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to two news stories originating in Honolulu, which appeared in Washington newspapers on Saturday and Sunday. We learn from the newspaper accounts that 26,000 dock and plantation workers are getting ready to walk-out because they protest the conviction of labor leader, Jack Hall, who heads up Harry Bridges' Union of International Longshoremen. Jack Hall and some eight other people, including the editor of the weekly newspaper Honolulu Record, were convicted by a jury as Communists who advocated the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States.

When these men, who have been found guilty of teaching the communistic doctrine of overthrowing the Government of the United States, can control and tie up the economic life of Honolulu by shutting down the sugar, the pineapple, and shipping industry, it is time that the Senate begin to sit up and take notice. Particularly is this true when we have the question of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska shortly coming before the Senate.

There has been much doubt in the minds of many people in the recent years as to the wisdom of admitting Hawaii at this time, solely because of the stranglehold which Harry Bridges and his Communist leaders have on the Territory of Hawaii. In recent months there has been mounting evidence that the Communist influence in Hawaii is increasing. In view of the United States Supreme Court having recently restored to Harry Bridges his citizenship rights and because his strength in the Territory of Hawaii remains supreme, it is not inconceivable that if Hawaii were admitted as a State in the Union, that Harry Bridges might become one of the first United States Senators.

paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) subdivision (a) of this section shall not apply with respect to any employee not a citizen of the United States who incurs an injury or death resulting in death subsequent to the effective date of this amendment."

Sec. 5. Section 5 (b) of the act of July 28, 1945 (ch. 328, 59 Stat. 505), is amended by—

(a) Inserting after the words "during the present war" the words "and until July 1, 1954."

(b) Adding at the end thereof the following: "The term 'enemy' as used in this subsection means any nation, government, or force engaged in armed conflict with the Armed Forces of the United States or of any nation, government, or force participating with the United States in any armed conflict." This subparagraph shall not apply in the case of a person not a citizen of the United States who suffers disability, or death after capture, detention, or other restraint by an enemy of the United States after the effective date of this amendment.

SEC. 6. Sections 1 (a) (13) and 1 (a) (17) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (ch. 570, 66 Stat. 332) are repealed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I hope the acting majority leader will request the distinguished Senator from Arizona to explain the bill and explain his amendment, because they differ from the previous bill, to which both he and I objected.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I shall a little later ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4126) to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits, until July 1, 1954, and that it be considered at this time, and, furthermore, that H. R. 4126 be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 1458, as proposed to be amended.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona whether the bill has been approved by the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am informed that to be the fact, and that the Committee on Banking and Currency has no objection to the motion I shall make.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona; he has answered my questions.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to submit a brief explanation of the bill and of the amendments proposed by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. I trust that the Senator from Arizona will submit an explanation, particularly of the amendments because there have been some changes in the language since the bill was introduced.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, Senate bill 1458 extends until July 1, 1954, two temporary statutes, Public Law 784, of the 77th Congress, and Public Law 161, for the 79th Congress.

The first law, Public Law 784, 77th Congress—56th United States Statutes at Large, page 1023—extended war-risk

hazard insurance to persons employed overseas by American contractors.

The second law, Public Law 161, 79th Congress—59th United States Statutes at Large, page 505—extended the same privileges, and provided for compensation of persons employed overseas who became prisoners of war of an enemy of the United States.

In considering Senate bill 1458, the Banking and Currency Committee discovered that Public Law 784 did not apply only to American citizens, but provided for war-risk hazard and detention benefits to certain persons other than American citizens who were employed outside the continental limits of the United States by contractors with the Government of the United States. The same is true of Public Law 161.

Great Britain and other nations have recognized their responsibilities to their nationals when employed outside the limits of their countries. However, we find that the United States law covering this subject covers anyone, regardless of whether a citizen of the United States, who is employed by a contractor outside the United States, under the specified circumstances.

Under the provisions of the law, as now written, a north African who was employed in the construction of a United States airbase in north Africa could receive compensation for injuries or death occurring while engaged in that work. Similarly, a person living in Formosa might, under the provisions of Public Law 161, receive benefits for detention, if he were taken prisoner by an enemy of the United States.

Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to go into some detail regarding the amounts which have been paid under these acts since 1942:

For detention benefits, the United States has paid \$17,461,441.

For disability benefits, \$1,973,564.

For death benefits, \$3,279,001.

For medical care, \$471,524.

The United States has been very fortunate in the operation of these acts, because approximately 95 percent of the payments have been made to American citizens. However, under these laws, as they are now written—we now propose that they be amended—persons other than citizens of the United States could receive the specified benefits. We wish to have the benefits limited to citizens of the United States. Some 2,000 persons have received war-risk payments under these two acts.

One of the committee amendments would amend section 301 of the act so as to exclude noncitizens of the United States from the category of persons required to be subject to coverage under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

The remaining committee amendment simply calls for the correction of one word.

I shall be very happy to answer any questions which my colleagues may have in regard to the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the

Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 4126; that House bill 4126 be considered at this time, and that it be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the text of Senate bill 1458, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary is discharged from the further consideration of House bill 4126.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of House bill 4126?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4126) to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits, until July 1, 1954.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, and pursuant to the request of the Senator from Arizona, House bill 4126 will be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause, and by inserting in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 1458, as it has been amended.

The House bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4126) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further consideration of Senate bill 1458 be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I wish to pay my respects to the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) for his success in having the bill amended so as to make it clearly understood that American citizens, not citizens of other countries, will be protected under the provisions of the bill. Without the enactment of this amendment noncitizens of the United States who might be employed for only 24 hours or less to work on certain United States Government projects overseas, would undoubtedly compete for the benefits of this law.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his kind remarks.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate bill 1901.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Interior and

Insular Affairs, I have the honor of Presenting at this time Senate bill 1901, the measure to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes, as amended and reported by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The bill as I introduced it on this subject matter was by way of being a worksheet for the committee. The amended bill that I am now presenting to the Senate, is, with its amendments, the committee's fulfillment of the commitment I made on behalf of the committee in connection with the passage last month of the submerged lands joint resolution. My colleagues will recall that measure, Senate Joint Resolution 13, now Public Law 31, was signed by the President on May 22.

I am mindful of the fact that at that time I said that within 2 weeks after the enactment of the submerged lands joint resolution, the committee would have before the Senate a bill providing for the administration of the area of the outer Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS FROM EXECUTIVE AGENCIES REQUIRED

The measure I am now discussing was reported on June 15, missing the deadline by several days. I apologize for the delay; but by way of extenuation, I plead the fact that we found the task even greater than anticipated. It was necessary to have further testimony and additional reports from the executive agencies, and these agencies also found they had a most difficult problem. A number of witnesses from industry and State official bodies were heard. The committee then held extensive executive sessions.

The result was greater delay than had been expected. However, I believe that the committee's improvements in the measure, based on the evidence we received and the discussion we held, justifies the delay.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe the RECORD should show that some Senators who were insisting that action be taken immediately on the Continental Shelf, as members of the committee joined in urging the chairman of the committee to take sufficient time to study this measure, when they saw the problems which developed.

Furthermore, only a few days before the passage of the submerged lands joint resolution a House bill dealing with the Continental Shelf was sent to the Senate and was passed on the Senate calendar, rather than being referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. So there was on the Senate Calendar, within a few days after the Senate acted on the joint resolution dealing with the submerged lands within the historic boundaries of the States, a bill dealing with the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is entirely correct in that statement.

AMENDMENTS AND PROPOSALS CONSIDERED

Mr. President, the committee of necessity considered the bill which was passed by the House, H. R. 5134, although as the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, that measure already was on the Senate calendar. We also had before us the proposal introduced by the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. HENDRICKSON), and an amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HILL). All these proposals and amendments, together with amendments offered by members of the committee, were given most careful consideration. The result of our efforts—and the acting chairman is not yet wholly satisfied with the results, as far as that goes—is Senate bill 1901, with some 89 committee amendments.

Mr. President, as was stated here at the beginning of the debate on Senate Joint Resolution 13, the committee early found that it had a very real and a most unusual problem before it, when the issue of the outer Continental Shelf was introduced into the consideration of the submerged lands within State boundaries as a result of the request from the Department of Justice that the problems of the continental shelf as a whole be resolved in "single package" legislation, as was stated at that time, after a fairly thorough study of the problem, and at least a recognition of most of the questions, if not a determination of their answers, it was clear to the committee that the responsibility of finding answers and embodying them in appropriate legislation for the outer Continental Shelf was a task that would take more time than the committee had to give it in our consideration of submerged lands within State boundaries. The committee determined that the matter should have separate attention from the Senate.

DUAL LEGISLATIVE APPROACH REQUIRED

I read the views of the committee, as they were set out in the report on Senate Joint Resolution 13, under Order 128, with respect to this very matter, as we presented it then to the Senate. From that report, on page 9, I read:

The complexity of the problem presented by the assumption by the United States of jurisdiction and control over the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf is immediately apparent from even a cursory examination of the Presidential proclamation. The declaration is limited to jurisdiction and control of the resources of the land mass; as stated in the proclamation, "the character as high seas of the waters above the Continental Shelf and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation are in no way thus affected." Clearly, we have here neither absolute sovereignty nor absolute ownership.

It must follow that the interest of the United States is, from a national and an international standpoint, politically and legally, sui generis. What Federal laws are applicable; what should apply? In what court, where situated, does jurisdiction lie, or where should it be placed? Should new Federal law be enacted where existing statutes are wholly inadequate, or should the laws of abutting States be made applicable? The necessity for answering these questions is clear when we take note of the fact that the full development of the estimated values in the shelf area will require the efforts and

the physical presence of thousands of workers on fixed structures in the shelf area. Industrial accidents, accidental death, peace, and order—these and many other problems and situations need and must have legislative attention.

After the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 13, your committee turned its attention to those questions, and it has tried to bring to the Senate in S. 1901 an answer to at least some of them.

Mr. President, it is my purpose, with the indulgence of the Senate, to present Senate bill 1901, section by section, insofar as the problems indicated in the quotation are concerned.

BILL A BIPARTISAN EFFORT

Before beginning my detailed presentation, I should like to say that all members of the committee worked, and worked hard, both in the hearings and in the prolonged executive sessions, in an attempt to present a reasonably comprehensive bill. This was a bipartisan effort in every sense of the word. There were, of course, different approaches, different views, and different interests. Every member of the committee worked day and night, and I can tell the Senate that we did have some night sessions.

Referring to the bill itself, Mr. President, section 1 is the usual title section; providing that the act may be cited as "the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act."

Section 2 provides definitions for the specific terms used in the act. I wish to call attention to the definition of "outer Continental Shelf," which is the area with which we are dealing. This definition provides:

(a) The term "outer Continental Shelf" means all submerged lands lying seaward and outside of the area of lands beneath navigable waters as defined in section 2 of the Submerged Lands Act (Public Law 31, 83d Cong., 1st session), and of which the subsoil and seabed appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction and control."

Thus, S. 1901 is legislatively joined with the Submerged Lands Act, just as the areas with which each measure deals are joined geographically and geologically. Politically they are, of course, properly separated, since the Submerged Lands Act deals with lands within State boundaries, while this bill concerns itself with the areas seaward of such boundaries.

Section 3 of S. 1901 is the general jurisdiction clause of the measure. It declares that "the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction, control, and power of disposition."

I call to the attention of the Members of the Senate the fact that the jurisdiction declared embraces the seabed and subsoil as an entity, and is not merely asserted over the natural resources of that seabed and subsoil, as was provided in the proclamation of September 28, 1945, and by section 9 of Public Law 31. This broadening of the jurisdiction asserted was made by the committee after hearing expert testimony on the national and international problems connected with the administration of the outer shelf, and after long deliberation.

NO INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS CREATED

I can say to the Senate that the Department of State finds no objection whatever to the broader jurisdiction now asserted from the point of view of our international relations. From the point of view of domestic law and administration, it seemed an absurdity to the acting chairman and other members of the committee to assert jurisdiction only over mineral resources, but not over the land that contained the mineral resources.

Among other things, the ocean bottom will in all probability be used for the transportation of a large part of the oil and gas recovered by means of pipelines. Obviously, the United States would have to have jurisdiction over that section of the ocean bottom on which the pipelines were laid as well as those portions of the seabed and subsoil that contained the actual oil, gas, sulfur, and probably other minerals. Therefore, the committee took the necessary and logical step forward of bringing the entire area within the jurisdiction of the United States.

At the same time we were careful to provide that the jurisdiction asserted is a "horizontal jurisdiction." Subsection (b) of section 3 provides in very specific terms that—

This act shall be construed in such manner that the character as high seas of the waters above the outer Continental Shelf and the right to navigation and fishing therein shall not be affected.

Thus, the jurisdiction asserted is only over the seabed and subsoil, not over the waters above that seabed and subsoil.

By this act, the United States is not extending its national boundaries or its national sovereignty out into the high seas to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf. Both the Department of State and representatives of the fishing industry from all sections of the United States warned the committee of the dangers of any such extension of American sovereignty into the high seas.

NO INTERFERENCE WITH FISHING OR NAVIGATION

The committee has made every effort to make clear its legislative intent that the act should in no wise be construed as such an assertion of national sovereignty over the ocean. Rather it is the plain intent of this measure to leave navigation and fishing in the outer shelf areas exactly where they now are. No change with respect to either navigation or fishing is provided or contemplated.

Section 4 might be said to be the heart of the bill legislatively and administratively. This section attempts to deal with the very complex problem of providing a body of law for the administration and development of the area over which jurisdiction and control is asserted. I may state that the committee considered several approaches to this problem. Obviously, one such approach would, of course, have been the extension of State laws and with them State boundaries to the outer edge of the shelf, thus bringing the seabed and subsoil within the boundaries of the States adjacent to it, at the same time retaining full Federal control, as in an area of

Federal jurisdiction within State boundaries on the uplands.

The Members of the Senate will recall that an approach somewhat along these lines was proposed by the very able junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] who has perhaps devoted more time and study to this problem than has any other Member of the Senate, and who is, in my opinion, unquestionably one of the foremost authorities in the world on the legal and political problems of the Continental Shelf. His bill, S. 294, would have provided for a cooperative management by the States and Federal Government of the outer shelf areas.

A generally similar solution to the problem was vigorously and ably sponsored in the committee by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

AREA ONE INVOLVING EXTERNAL SOVEREIGNTY

On the other hand, as pointed out in the report made by the Department of Justice on S. 1901, the area is one in which national and international problems intermingle. The outer Continental Shelf is not and never has been within the boundary of any State or Territory, and it is, therefore, uniquely an area of exclusive Federal jurisdiction and control. The report submitted on behalf of Attorney General Brownell stresses these two facts.

The Department of Justice views are set forth in the committee report on S. 1901, Report No. 411, and it is also found in the hearings on S. 1901, along with oral testimony of Mr. J. Lee Rankin, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, which begins on page 625 of the hearings. The report of the Department of Justice states in part:

This—that is, the outer Continental Shelf—is a Federal area, outside State boundaries, and to give the States a sort of extraterritorial jurisdiction over it is unnecessary and undesirable. The situation is not comparable to that of federally owned areas within a State, as to which State law has some measure of applicability. Particularly in view of the intermingling of national and international rights in the area, it is important that the Federal Government, which has the responsibility for handling foreign relations, have the exclusive control of lawmaking and law enforcement there.

The report of the Secretary of the Interior, which begins on page 26 of the committee report, is in full accord with the views of the Department of Justice. Secretary McKay, in discussing the provisions of the House bill, H. R. 5134, which does provide for the extension of the laws of the States, declares:

Moreover, they—that is, the provisions of H. R. 5134—appear to be inconsistent with a statement by the President dated May 22, 1953, issued by the White House on the occasion of the signing by him of the Submerged Lands Act, in which the President unqualifiedly said that the submerged lands outside of the historic boundaries of the States . . . should be administered by the Federal Government.

However, as every Member of the Senate knows, the Federal Code was never designed to be a complete body of law in and of itself. It has grown up side by side and along with State laws, and under our system of dual State-Federal

sovereignty, the greater part of the conduct of everyday affairs is under State law and State administration.

APPLICATION OF MARITIME LAW CONSIDERED

The committee first attempted to provide housekeeping law for the outer shelf by applying to the structures necessary for the removal of the minerals in the area under the maritime law of the United States. This was first attempted by incorporating by reference the admiralty statutes. This solution as first seemed to be a reasonably complete answer to the immediate needs for mineral development in the area, inasmuch as the drilling platforms would have been treated as vessels. Maritime law, which applies to American vessels, would have applied under that theory to the structures themselves.

However, further consideration clearly showed that this approach was not an adequate and complete answer to the problem. The so-called social laws necessary for protection of the workers and their families would not apply. I refer to such things as unemployment laws, industrial-accident laws, fair-labor-standard laws, and so forth. It was necessary that the protection afforded by such laws be extended to the outer Shelf area because of the fact that ultimately some 10,000 or more men might be employed in mineral-resource development there. The several "social laws" were first applied by reference.

COMMITTEE DIVIDED ON ADOPTION OF STATE LAW

After a further and more thorough consideration of the overall problem, and the hearing of expert testimony from competent lawyers practicing in the field of admiralty law, the committee, by a divided vote, determined to apply to the area, first, that body of basic Federal law found in the United States Constitution. Incidentally, it was necessary to make specific provision for application of the Constitution, or it would not have been applicable. Second, it was determined to make applicable the whole body of Federal law which applies today to those areas inside the States owned by the Federal Government under exclusive Federal jurisdiction.

By the use of this particular approach, it became unnecessary to make applicable to the structures, by reference to either the maritime law or the social laws, as all those laws, so far as necessary, were made applicable by the extension of the whole body of Federal law to the area. Thus, the legal situation is comparable to that in the areas owned by the Federal Government under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government and lying within the boundaries of a State in the uplands.

As a part of the same amendment, the committee provided, first, that the laws of abutting States should become a part of the Federal law within such areas opposite the States as would have been included in the States were their boundaries extended to the edge of the Continental Shelf.

Section 4 of the bill takes care of all those provisions. The enactment as Federal law by reference of the laws of the several abutting States meets the

major constitutional objection, in that the laws so adopted are the laws as they exist at the time of the enactment of S. 1901. Only already existing State laws will become the law of the United States, and amendatory legislation by the States thereafter will not be applicable, unless made so by later Federal legislation.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

Section 4 also provides that the law of the United States enacted by reference, namely, the laws of the abutting States, shall be administered and enforced by appropriate officers and courts of the United States. The legal effect of such a provision is that if the bill be enacted the areas opposite each of the littoral States will be subject to the same Federal law as are Federal lands located within a State and under exclusive Federal jurisdiction.

The outer Continental Shelf will have the protection of the Constitution itself, and will have the protection and provision for conduct of affairs as given by the laws of each of the abutting States within the area immediately opposite that State.

Section 4 provides that these areas shall be described by lines fixed by the President of the United States and published in the Federal Register. This provision is made in order that there may be certainty as to jurisdiction in the whole of the area of the outer shelf.

The third paragraph of section 4, found on page 4 of the bill, contains a further provision which I desire to call to the attention of the Senate. It reads:

(a) The provisions of this section for adoption of State law as the law of the United States shall never be interpreted as a basis for claiming any interest in or jurisdiction on behalf of any State for any purpose over the seabed and subsoil of the outer Continental Shelf, or the property and natural resources thereof or the revenues therefrom.

This paragraph is self-explanatory. It is the view of the committee that the adoption as Federal law of the body of State law of each of the abutting States confers upon such State no legal right of any kind or character. The law of that State, as it is found of record, is by reference made the law of the United States as to the seabed and subsoil of the outer Continental Shelf, and the structures for mineral development on it, opposite said State and within the boundaries determined and published by the President, but such submerged lands and structures do not become a part of the State for any purpose.

This amendment was adopted by a divided vote of the committee. The acting chairman of the committee was not one of those who voted in favor of the amendment. The acting chairman has an obligation, on behalf of his committee, to present the bill as it was approved by the committee.

AMENDMENT MAY CREATE PROBLEMS

However, I feel that I would be less than candid if I tried to lead the Senate to believe that the adoption of State law as Federal law opposite the seaward boundaries of the several States will solve all the problems in the legal field of the outer Continental Shelf. Personally, I

am not at all certain that the adoption of this amendment will not create more problems than it will solve. Whether that be true is not at the moment possible of proof. On the other hand, I must concede that I recognize that in the absence of the adoption of State law, there would also be some very difficult problems to be faced in conduct of operations in the area.

Speaking only for myself, I would have preferred to apply to the outer Continental Shelf the body of Federal law to the extent that it applies to Federal areas within exclusive Federal jurisdiction and within any one of the several States, and thereafter to meet the need for additional law as the need arose.

PRECEDENTS EXIST FOR ADOPTION OF STATE LAWS

I recognize that the problem has two sides. I am not prepared to argue categorically that I am right and those entertaining contrary views are wrong. It is a matter which only time can determine. I am satisfied as to the legality of what is recommended. In the history of the United States there have been instances of the application of State law by reference. There is no question in my mind as to the constitutionality of the provision. My doubts go only to its practicability.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, does the Senator prefer not to yield until he completes his remarks?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I congratulate the distinguished Senator and the other members of his committee. I think they have worked not only long and hard, but most capably. I personally am deeply appreciative of the work they have done, and of the bill they have reported.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question with respect to certain facts in the background of the bill. I ask him if these are not the facts. That the assets to be found and developed in the area covered are entirely Federal? That the Federal Government is wholly the proprietor? That the jurisdiction to handle the substantial questions which are involved therein must remain in the Congress? That the bill represents the considered judgment of the majority of the committee that this is the soundest approach that can be made on the basis of all the facts now available? That Congress holds and retains jurisdiction to correct, perfect, and complete the law, as experience may indicate it needs perfection? That the bill is presented against the background that Congress expects a process of perfection to follow the enactment of this, the original approach to the unique problems with which the committee has dealt? Is not that the real approach which the committee has made? Does not this Congress expect corrections, perfections, and completion of its action to take place in subsequent Congresses from time to time?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Florida has stated the situation better than could the Senator from Oregon.

Senators are familiar with the old saying that "the railroads were ahead of railroad law." A similar situation exists in this case. The operations on the outer shelf precede, and of necessity

precede, the law. The law will come as the need for it arises.

DEVELOPMENT CAN GO FORWARD

The acting chairman of the committee feels that, in any event, there is set forth in the bill enough basic housekeeping legislation to permit the going forward of the operations for the development and removal of the presently known mineral values of the shelf.

There is no interference with the international situation with respect to the outer Continental Shelf area. There is a recognition, from cover to cover, in the bill, of the sole jurisdiction and control of the seabed and subsoil by the Federal Government, but no change in the character of the waters nor with respect to fishing or navigation in them.

Mr. President, I shall not go into detail as to the specific provisions in the bill which were found necessary in order that the housekeeping requirements might be met. I refer, among other things, to jurisdiction for the purpose of providing a forum for the trial of cases or controversies, for application of the Federal law for workmen's compensation, for special jurisdiction with respect to the National Labor Relations Act and its administration, and so forth. Those are matters concerning which the committee found it necessary to particularize in the bill.

The remainder of the bill has to do with the mechanics of the leasing of the area by the Secretary of the Interior for the recovery of the minerals therein. The committee followed in the footsteps of the former administration and of the Supreme Court in providing for validation of good-faith State leases which meet certain standards and requirements. The committee did what appeared to it to be simple equity by providing for the maintenance under the Federal Government of those leases for oil and gas, and in some instances, other minerals which were made between private persons or corporations and the coastal States prior to the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Louisiana and Texas cases, found in 339th United States Reports at page 699, and 399th United States Reports, at page 707, respectively.

PROVISION FOR SULFUR LEASING

The bill also provides the power in the Secretary of the Interior to make new leases on unleased areas to persons who desire to develop the minerals in the outer shelf. After considerable testimony the committee included specific provisions with respect to the development and recovery of sulfur in the outer shelf.

In connection with the sulfur leasing provisions it was the view of the committee that there should be set as one of the standards a minimum royalty of 10 percent with respect to sulfur. Frankly, the committee did not have sufficient knowledge to be at all certain that the 10 percent fixed in the bill was the correct percentage for royalty in connection with the recovery of sulfur. We preferred to err, if at all, on the side of protecting the interests of the United States. Representations were made to the effect that a 5 percent royalty was the maximum that could be paid by

those who would use the presently known technological processes, particularly the Frasch process, for recovery of sulfur from the submerged lands.

That may be the correct percentage; but because the committee did not have the time to go into the subject at sufficient length to reach a sound, considered, and advised conclusion, it set the minimum royalty at 10 percent. In its report, it requests the Secretary of the Interior to make a continuous study of the question and, after he has reached conclusions, to submit them to the committee so that corrective action may be taken, if necessary.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. As the distinguished acting chairman of the committee knows, the junior Senator from Louisiana was one of those most zealous in trying to obtain for the Government, whether it be the Federal or State government, as much revenue as possible. In the committee the junior Senator from Louisiana voted for the 10 percent royalty on sulfur. Since that time he has seen additional evidence to indicate that nowhere in any sulfur development in the United States is a 10 percent royalty paid. Five percent seems to be about the highest that is paid anywhere in the United States.

There are quite a few sulfur leases which would provide, perhaps, as much as 10 percent, but no one develops sulfur on such leases. What seems to have happened has been that a company seeking a lease for oil would obtain a lease which would include other minerals, and under that lease it would agree that if sulfur were produced, the producer would pay a royalty of 10 percent. The facts in those cases were that the leases could be held by oil and gas production without the necessity of producing any sulfur. It seems to me that most companies which accepted leases under those terms simply took the sulfur as an additional right without any requirement to develop sulfur, and therefore were willing to agree to any particular royalty for sulfur, no matter how high it might be.

The junior Senator from Louisiana finds himself in the position of questioning whether the committee, in its zeal to protect the national interest, has been so overzealous as to make it impossible to obtain any sulfur development. I am sure the acting chairman of the committee has had some information made available to him to the effect that there is no sulfur development in the United States under any leases in which persons have agreed to pay as much as 10-percent royalty.

Mr. CORDON. The acting chairman has no information that is contrary to the statement of the junior Senator from Louisiana. The trouble is that the acting chairman does not have enough information on the whole subject.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. Surely.

Mr. MARTIN. I notice that reference is made to 12½ percent for oil and gas. Of course, that is the prevailing royalty

which has been charged for many years, but it applies to ordinary operations. How much consideration did the committee give to the additional expense involved in operations such as the ones involved on the Continental Shelf? What I am getting at is, I do not want to see the royalty set so high that it will prevent operation.

Mr. CORDON. The committee had before it representatives of the industry, and discussed this subject, among many others, with them in the field of the practical application of the kind of legislation that we wanted to report. There was no objection made to the minimum of 12½ percent proposed in the bill.

ROYALTY REQUIRED BY STATE LEASES

The facts as presented to the committee are to the effect that there are several hundred leases outstanding at the present time, most of them, of course, with respect to more shallow water than in the outer Continental Shelf area. These leases carry that minimum royalty, and in addition, the bidding produced very considerable bonuses.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the Senator very much. It seems to me that it will be a very expensive operation, and we do not want to make the royalty so high as to make it impractical to operate the property. That is what I was getting at.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not correct to say that on all of the leases which were issued by the States on the outer Continental Shelf prior to the Supreme Court decision, a 12½ percent royalty was provided?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. The committee heard no testimony that the proposed royalty, as a minimum, would cause any less interest in the area or cause companies to refuse to bid in the area? Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, did not the testimony of the offshore lessees inform the committee that the lessees were also able to pay the State tax in addition to a one-eighth royalty, which is a royalty of at least 12½ percent?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Insofar as Louisiana leases are concerned, that would amount to payments running to almost 20 percent, when the additional royalty is added, as the bill provides, to compensate for the fact that the oil companies will not be paying the severance tax. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not correct to say that the detail to which the able Senators have just referred and about which they have asked pungent questions is but an illustration of the fact presented by my former questions, namely, that as experiences accumulate in the operation of this great unknown field, we

will probably find the need for changing royalties, as we find what the cost of production will be at various depths and what the volume of production is that might be anticipated, just as we may have to change many other details in the bill by subsequent legislation?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct. There is involved an area extending from a few feet in depth out to where the depth may be 500 or 600 feet. Certainly in the areas of greater depth of water the costs will be comparably higher than nearer to the shore, and as operations extend seaward, need for change in the royalty provisions may be indicated. However, experience will take care of the situation. Of course the act, like other laws, will be subject to whatever changes are necessary in order to make it effective for its purposes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I was not sure, from the question of the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, whether the severance tax and gross sales tax which are now imposed by the States will be paid in addition to the royalties.

Mr. CORDON. The answer is yes. Paragraph (9) on page 16 of the bill reads as follows:

(9) the holder thereof pays to the Secretary within the period or periods specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection an amount equivalent to any severance, gross production, or occupation taxes imposed by the State issuing the lease on the production from the lease, less the State's royalty interest in such production, between June 5, 1950, and the effective date of this act and not heretofore paid to the State, and thereafter pays to Secretary as an additional royalty on the production from the lease, less the United States royalty interest in such production, a sum of money equal to the amount of the severance, gross production, or occupation taxes which would have been payable on such production to the State issuing the lease under its laws as they existed on the effective date of this act.

That provision deals with a possible windfall which the lessees might get otherwise. It will make the royalty paid the Federal Government on existing leases vary between 18 and 19½ percent. That is the 12½ percent base royalty plus the State production, severance, or use taxes, which varies as between the State of Texas and the State of Louisiana. Louisiana has a slightly higher tax than does the State of Texas with respect to oil and gas operations.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. The Senator has been developing this subject in a very able manner and has brought out the facts. I think there will be no question that it will be necessary to change the law from time to time as experience dictates.

Personally I believe the production from these lands will not in anyway be nearly as great as some of us had hoped.

The reason I am referring to these points is that I do not want to see the royalties made so high that companies will not feel like operating the lands. I would like to see the time come when America can have a full supply of oil not only for our domestic needs but also

for our defense needs. I do not wish to see the time come when, if the United States were engaged in a worldwide war, submarines could prevent the United States from obtaining the supply of oil it would need. I had hoped that the oil we need would be obtainable within our own borders.

This measure is entirely a part of that plan.

I believe the committee has done an outstanding job, and I am in entire accord with the work of the committee.

I appreciate that probably it is impossible to fix the fair royalty, and I see no reason why the States should not receive the severance taxes, under the leases they already have made, because they made them in good faith. I also believe the States should receive the gross production tax on those leases, because they were made in good faith.

I wish to point out that the committee has done an outstandingly fine job on this measure.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, let me say that I am most appreciative of the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

PRIOR MINERAL LEASING ACTS NOT APPLICABLE

I should like to make an additional statement regarding section 4 of S. 1901.

In applying the Federal law to the area in question, the committee's recommendation is that the mineral leasing laws of the United States which otherwise might be applicable shall not apply to the outer Continental Shelf, because the bill itself set up the leasing procedures for the outer Continental Shelf.

On page 3, in lines 19 to 22, there is the following proviso: "Provided, however, That mineral leases on the outer Continental Shelf shall be maintained or issued only under the provisions of this act."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My question is directed to page 16, paragraph (9). Perhaps the Senator from Oregon would prefer to deal a little later with that portion of the bill.

Mr. CORDON. We may as well deal with it now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me give an illustration: Suppose a State already has collected approximately 18 percent on (a) royalties, (b) severance taxes, and (c) bonus payments or rents. What would be the relationship of the minimum 12½ percent Federal royalty on the leases on the outer Continental Shelf, already granted by the States to private parties? Would the 12½ percent be in addition to the 18 percent, or would it be subtracted from the 18 percent, or would it be waived?

Mr. CORDON. The validity of leases on the outer shelf has been in question since the Supreme Court decisions. However, the Supreme Court in none of the three decisions required the States to account to the Federal Government as to the moneys theretofore collected. That was true both as to areas inside State boundaries and areas outside the State boundaries.

The provisions for validation of leases do not become operative until, of course, the enactment of the bill. The measure has not retroactive effect.

EQUIVALENT OF STATE TAX TO BE PAID FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

As of the time of enactment of the bill, there will thereafter be due nothing to the States; but there will continue to be due to the United States 12½ percent royalty, plus, after enactment, the equivalent of the State severance, production, or use tax in effect at the time the lease was issued.

There are various names for these State taxes, but in essence they are primarily severance taxes. There will then be payable to the United States 12½ percent royalty, plus the taxes which theretofore had been levied by the respective States, and that would gross between 18 and 19½ percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would there be any rebates to the States?

Mr. CORDON. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There would be no rebates to the States?

Mr. CORDON. No, none.

On the other hand, neither is there in this bill any provision for the making of a claim against the States for any collections made by them prior to the time of the enactment of this measure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the States are to receive or be allowed to retain the amounts they have received from leases in the outer Continental Shelf between the time of the decisions of the Supreme Court and the date of the enactment of this measure; and thereafter the Federal Government is to receive these amounts; is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. Yes. The date of the Louisiana and Texas decisions is June 5, 1950. It has to do with royalties, not taxes. From June 5, 1950, the date of the Texas and Louisiana decisions, the royalties have been paid to the United States under Operating Orders issued by the Secretary of the Interior to permit producing wells to continue to produce and thus prevent waste. So the United States has received those royalties.

It is also my understanding that the States have continued to levy a production tax since the decisions, and have been collecting that tax. So far as I know, no objection to such tax collections by the States has been made by the Federal Government.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me at this point?

Mr. CORDON. I yield. I wish to obtain all the information on this subject I can obtain. I am not too fully advised.

Mr. LONG. In order that the Record may be a little more complete, it should be pointed out that in most instances the revenue to the Federal Government has not been in the form of royalties, but, rather, in the form of rentals. For example, off the coast of Texas there is no oil production in the outer Continental Shelf. There is only one small well even in the 10-mile limit off Texas. Large payments are being made to the Federal Government on rentals on those

leases, in order to keep the leases in effect, in the absence of any production.

The order issued by the Supreme Court and the Secretary of the Interior forbade those oil companies to drill, in order to hold their leases by means of production. Therefore, the only way they could hold them was by making payments on the leases, by offering payments to the Federal Government, which of course the Secretary of the Interior has received perhaps without any other authority than that given him by the President to accept money offered to the Federal Government.

Off Louisiana there is some production, although at this time it is not great. Even in the case of Louisiana, by far the large percentage of the revenue received is that paid as rentals. The Louisiana leases have a standard provision to the effect that those who bid for leases make bonus payments, which may have been as much as \$500,000 for 5,000 acres. The leases further provide that for the next 5 years or until minerals are produced, annual rentals in amount of one-half of the bonus payments shall be paid. In other words, if a person had paid a \$500,000 bonus for a lease, he would be required to pay an additional \$250,000 a year to keep his lease alive until he discovered oil or gas in paying quantities.

These payments constitute 80 to 90 percent of the total amounts received thus far from the area.

Where there is production, the Federal Government has received the royalty payments that would have to be made under the lease.

The windfall provision of the bill—namely, the provision that when the Federal Government takes over, it will collect an additional amount of royalty, which as nearly as possible will be equal to the amount of the severance tax—came about as a result of the committee's study of this matter. When the so-called windfall provision was offered, there was no particular objection in the committee. I was one of the members of the committee who felt that the States, rather than the Federal Government, should receive those funds. But all of us felt that if the Federal Government were to receive those funds, that would be preferable, rather than to have the funds not collected at all—feeling that even if the States did not receive any consideration, the payments should be collected, because the oil companies expected to pay State taxes when they obtained the leases.

I hope that statement will help clarify the situation for my colleagues.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask the Senator from Oregon about the disposition of the amounts paid as royalties, bonuses, and rents on the leases granted by States on the outer Continental Shelf, and which have been in operation between June 1950, and the present time.

Mr. CORDON. The royalties and rentals have been paid to the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is title to those sums confirmed by this bill in the United States?

Mr. CORDON. For all practical purposes, yes. There is no specific provision confirming title in so many words, but section 9 of the bill provides that all sums paid from June 5, 1950, to the date of enactment to either the Secretary of the Navy or to the Secretary of the Interior under any outer shelf lease shall be deposited in the Federal Treasury. I know of no basis upon which the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Interior could be questioned for making the payments into the Federal Treasury.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that the severance taxes have not been paid on the oil taken from the outer Continental Shelf since the Supreme Court's decisions?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct; that is my understanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The severance taxes have not been paid?

Mr. CORDON. They have not been paid to the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Have they been paid to the States?

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator will find that in some instances the oil companies have made payments of the severance tax to the States, and that some companies have made payments right up to the present time.

The point of view of those companies, so far as I know, has been that inasmuch as they hold State leases, it would, in effect, be inferred that their leases were not valid if they declined to pay the tax. Therefore, they felt that in order to protect their leases, they should pay to the States the severance tax.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under the bill, what happens to the amounts which the companies have paid into the State treasuries, under leases, for oil taken from the outer Continental Shelf since June 1950?

Mr. CORDON. The bill makes no provision with respect to moneys which may have been paid to the State after that date, taking the view that that is a matter between the company and the State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is no claim filed on behalf of the National Government for that amount. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. The bill provides that, irrespective of the amount the company may have paid to the State, beginning with June 5, 1950, all rentals and royalties are payable to the Federal Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask another question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does that apply in those cases where the companies have not paid severance taxes to the States, and therefore no taxes have been paid, if the Federal Government now files claims equal to the amount of what the severance taxes would have been during this period?

Mr. CORDON. By the term "this period," the Senator means from June 5, 1950, does he not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. Let me read the provision to the Senator again, then he will have the answer to his question. The provision is:

The holder thereof—

That is, the holder of the lease—

pays to the Secretary within the period or periods specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection an amount equivalent to any severance, gross production, or occupation taxes imposed by the State issuing the lease on the production from the lease, less the State's royalty interest in such production, between June 5, 1950, and the effective date of this act and not heretofore paid to the State, and thereafter pays to the Secretary as an additional royalty on the production from the lease, less the United States royalty interest in such production, a sum of money equal to the amount of the severance, gross production, or occupation taxes which would have been payable on such production to the State issuing the lease under its laws as they existed on the effective date of this act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder whether the very learned Senator from Oregon would be willing to translate that into nontechnical language, so that the meaning would be absolutely clear; because I must admit I failed to follow after the second qualifying clause.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is endeavoring to be as clear as he can be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder whether a series of written questions could be propounded, which the Senator from Oregon would be willing to answer.

Mr. CORDON. Certainly, if the Senator prefers that method. I have endeavored to read the language, and to interpret it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oregon has read it very accurately.

Mr. CORDON. But the language in paragraph 9, as I understand it, means that the owner of the lease, in order to have that lease maintained, must pay to the United States an amount of money equal to a severance tax that he would have had to pay to the State upon the net amount of production; and when I say "net amount of production," I mean the amount of production after deduction of the State's royalty share.

Another provision provides for Federal royalty payments. This section, section 9, goes only to the possible windfall. The section provides that a lessee shall pay the amount of the tax to the Federal Government, if he has not theretofore paid it to the State. That is as near as I can get it. He is not required to pay twice, that is, both to the State and to the Federal Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the windfall of the unpaid severance tax goes to the Federal Government.

Mr. CORDON. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But if the severance tax has been paid, the Federal Government does not interfere with the rights of the States to have collected these sums during the intervening period. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. In addition to paying the amount of any unpaid severance tax to the Federal Government, is it not true, of course, that the lessees would have to pay to the Federal Government, all rental and royalty payments due under their leases, from June 5, 1950, to the effective date of this act, before they could have leases confirmed under the terms of this act?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. In other words, they must come up to date, from June 5, 1950, and pay to the Federal Government any unpaid rentals, royalties, or unpaid severance taxes. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. The lessees must pay to the Federal Government all of the rents and royalties due from June 5, 1950, that they have not already paid to the Federal Government. But as to State taxes, they need not pay them twice.

As I have stated in my first answer to the Senator from Illinois, there is no requirement that they pay the equivalent of the severance taxes from June 5, 1950, until the date of the enactment of this measure, if they have paid it to the State. But they must either have paid it to the State, or they must now pay it to the Federal Government; they are not relieved of it.

PRESIDENT CAN WITHDRAW AREAS FROM LEASING

Mr. President, I shall take but a few moments to complete my presentation. I call attention to the fact that this bill protects the rights of the Government in connection with any necessity for reserving a portion of the minerals in the area. This may be done by the President, and is similar to the President's powers with respect to Federal areas in the uplands.

There is provision for a reservation of uranium, thorium, and other materials of a fissionable nature, as set out in the Atomic Energy Act. There is reserved the right to extract helium. There is a provision in section 14, beginning on page 29, protecting prior rights, if any. This is exactly the same provision enacted into law in Senate Joint Resolution 13. There follows the usual separability clause; and, because of the administrative necessities in this bill, a provision in section 15 for appropriations.

PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION MADE OPERATIVE

Mr. President, the bill is intended to make operative the Proclamation of the President of the United States, on September 28, 1945, and the jurisdiction asserted therein is extended to include the whole of the seabed and subsoil of the outer Continental Shelf. This area, according to the only informed estimates that have come to the attention of the Senator from Oregon, namely, those of the United States Geological Survey, contains an estimated five-sixths of the total oil and gas reserves of the whole Continental Shelf, both within and without State boundaries.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the adoption of the committee amendments to the pending bill, my amendment, designated 6-18-53—L, be considered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is the amendment to which the Senator from New Jersey refers the one which proposes to dispose of the rentals?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to reserve the right to object, because I have just filed at the desk an amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and 28 other Senators providing that the funds shall be used for the national defense for an intermediate period, and then, subsequently, for the purpose of primary, secondary, and higher education, in which the method of disposition is somewhat different from that proposed by the Senator from New Jersey in his amendment. I should be reluctant to give to the Senator from New Jersey priority in the consideration of his amendment as compared to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. There is nothing to prevent the Senator from Alabama from offering his amendment as a substitute for my amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the absence of the Senator from Alabama, who is attending an Appropriations Committee meeting—

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, rather than have any controversy over the matter, both amendments being aimed at the same worthy purpose, I withdraw my request.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the action of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that the reason why I asked unanimous consent was so that I might leave the floor. I do not think any amendments will be called up tonight.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am quite certain that probably the Senator from New Jersey will be able to catch the eye of the Presiding Officer before the Senator from Alabama will be able to do so, but I did not want to foreclose the right of the Senator from Alabama to rise to his feet and try to beat the Senator from New Jersey to the punch.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, let me say for the RECORD that I would not follow any course which would deprive any Senator of any right on the floor.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it had been my intention to address the Senate this afternoon on the subject of International Trade Agreements. I so notified the press by a press release. However, I shall make my address tomorrow, in view of the fact that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] desires to address the Senate today on the issues relating to public power.

DESPERATE SITUATION OF THE CATTLE INDUSTRY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the situation of cattlemen in Texas

and the southwest generally is fast becoming desperate.

They are faced, on the one hand, with ruinously decreased prices for their cattle—on the other, with the most devastating drought that area has ever known.

Every day I receive letters and telegrams and telephone calls from Texas cattlemen about the plight in which they find themselves through no fault of their own. They need help—desperately.

Here is what a cattleman in Sabinal, Tex., writes me:

The ranchers in Texas, both large and small, are facing a very serious situation.

For 3 years we have faced high-feed prices and drouth, plus falling prices on livestock. We cannot continue without financial aid (banks have cut ranchers off several months ago) and a subsidy price set on livestock. . . .

The three generations of my family have owned and operated the same land in Uvalde and Medina Counties for a total of 93 years. Never before has the outlook been so black. . . .

Cattle producers in Texas are doomed without some help immediately.

That letter sums up the situation. It is typical of letters my office receives every day from Texas cattlemen.

A man from Wellington, Tex., writes as follows:

The people generally are scared, and this is true throughout the Panhandle area of Texas. The banks have extended as much credit to the producers as they can, and, in many instances, there has been overextended credit to those who have dealt in livestock.

The Del Rio (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce, has officially requested that "the Government take the necessary steps to provide a system of credit for those engaged in agriculture in the drought-disaster area to enable them to stay in business."

And so it goes. These are not the complaints of people who are seeking something for nothing. They are cries for help from self-reliant men who have just about reached the end of their rope.

On last Saturday, a twofold program designed to bring the cattlemen some measure of relief was placed before a called meeting of directors and committee members of the American National Livestock Association in Chicago.

The program calls for the extension of additional credit facilities to cattlemen and for making emergency supplies of feed available to them.

It is expected that this program will be brought to Washington by a special committee and placed before President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

Mr. President, the cattlemen are in truly critical straits. They must have help—now.

This is not a political issue in any sense of the term. It is a problem with ramifications that affect the entire country. It is a problem that must be faced and solved.

Mr. T. E. Johnson, the able editor of the Amarillo Globe-Times, published in the cattle kingdom known as the Texas Panhandle, recently devoted his front-page editorial column to this subject.

What Mr. Johnson wrote about the problem of the cattlemen is authoritative. It is based on firsthand information.

I believe all Senators would gain in understanding of this problem by reading Mr. Johnson's editorial column in the Amarillo Globe-Times of June 16. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be reproduced in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"One of the most cruel statements I've ever read."

A banker from a Panhandle town was on the phone. He was describing drought conditions facing many farmers in his county.

He has some definite ideas about the need of aid on the part of many of the farmers in his area, farmers who are customers of his bank—farmers who are good, solid citizens, who've helped develop their home communities and the country, but who at this point are victims of a prolonged drought.

"If that man who referred to them as 'yapping agrarians who got their fingers scorched' could know these men as I do, he certainly wouldn't have made such a statement."

The banker, of course, was talking about a Republican leader in Amarillo—a former GOP county chairman—who had written a letter to Congressman BOB POAGE of Waco, rebuking him for having discussed in Congress the other day the need of help for Texas farmers and cattlemen who are drought victims.

Some of the other Republicans in official capacity, however, were quick to disclaim credit for the ex-chairman's letter and his views; but we haven't seen from any of them any proposals to help farmers and stockmen meet and ride out the crisis many of them face at this time.

But be that as it may, and regardless of the different views held by the different factions within the Republican Party—on farm policies as well as on many other national policies, for that matter—farmers and stockmen in the Southwest are direly in need of financial aid and sufficient feedstuffs to keep their stock alive, and should in no manner be ashamed to place their problems before governing authorities, State or Federal.

Emergency programs of government are for such purposes, and should be sponsored and administered without thought of politics.

Instead of being "yapping agrarians," they are decent, solid, law-abiding, taxpaying citizens who're trying their dead-level best to keep from going broke, and seeking ways and means of holding on to part of what they possess.

If this involves a little extra credit made possible by the Federal Government, and a little feed for their livestock from the Government's emergency rations, well—so what?

Thus, it is reassuring that there are some with definite ideas as to how help may be obtained, and who are willing to go to bat for their neighbors and friends—the farmers and cattlemen of Texas—and with politics into the discard.

Jay Taylor of Amarillo, one of the State's outstanding stockmen and bankers and member of Secretary Benson's national advisory committee, is en route to Chicago to place a program before representatives of Government and private agencies to make relief available which he believes is merited by many of his neighbors.

In the main, those needing assistance, need it in two definite forms—extended credit, and feed, and feed immediately.

It is such a program that Mr. Taylor is seeking for cattlemen—and it is a similar

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I believe it would be helpful in the consideration of the pending measure, in connection with which there are some eighty-odd amendments, most of them perfecting or clarifying in character, if the bill, as proposed by the committee to be amended, might be considered as the original text of the bill, and so be subject to amendment without having any question raised as to the degree of amendment. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill as proposed to be amended, and as reported from the committee, may be considered as the original text of the bill for purposes of amendment and final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey on behalf of himself and the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 25, beginning with line 20, it is proposed to strike out all through line 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 9. Disposition of revenues: (a) All rentals, royalties, and other sums paid under any lease on the outer Continental Shelf for the period from June 5, 1950, to date, and thereafter shall be deposited by the Secretary and the Secretary of the Navy in the Treasury of the United States. Such rentals, royalties, and other sums received during the present national emergency shall be held in a special account in the Treasury, and until the Congress provides otherwise, shall be used, except for the payment of refunds under the provisions of section 10 of this act, only for such urgent developments essential to the national defense and national security as the Congress may determine.

(b) Except for amounts paid out as refunds under the provisions of section 10 of this act such rentals, royalties, and other sums received after the termination of such national emergency shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury within 90 days after the termination of the fiscal year in which received, to the several States and

Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia in an amount to each such State and Territory and the District of Columbia which bears the same ratio to the total of such rentals, royalties, and other sums received during such year (less the total of such refunds during such year) as the total number of individuals enrolled in the schools in such State or Territory or the District of Columbia according to the latest Federal census bears to the total number of individuals enrolled in the schools in all such States and Territories and the District of Columbia according to such census. Payments received under the provisions of this section shall be used by such States and Territories and the District of Columbia solely for the purposes of primary, secondary, and higher education.

On page 26, lines 11 and 12 it is proposed to strike out "any moneys not otherwise appropriated" and insert in lieu thereof "money paid into the Treasury under the provisions of section 9 of this act."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, my remarks this afternoon will be addressed to the amendment which has just been read by the clerk. As is well known, it is proposed to Senate bill 1901, the so-called outer Continental Shelf bill. I am happy to say that the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has joined me in offering the amendment.

The junior Senator from New Jersey first proposed a similar amendment to the distinguished Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a few months ago when, under the splendid leadership of the senior Senator from Oregon, its acting chairman, the submerged-lands resolution was before it for consideration.

The amendment was informally proposed at that time to the committee because it was my understanding that a separate bill, dealing with the development of the outer Continental Shelf, would be offered following the so-called tidelands measure, and it was not my purpose to bring to a vote on the Senate floor my amendments which dealt exclusively with the development of the outer shelf and the revenues derived therefrom.

My original amendment, Mr. President, called for exclusive Federal control and development of those submerged lands lying seaward of the States' historic boundaries in the outer Continental Shelf.

Secondly, my original amendment would vary the aid to education amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

The variation is an important one, in my opinion, Mr. President.

I intend to explain it in more detail in just a few moments.

As I said, the original amendment was not offered for the purpose of a vote at the time the submerged lands resolution was before the Senate.

Now, however, since Senate 1901 is pending business, and since it spells out Federal development rights in the outer Continental Shelf, the subject of the first portion of my amendment is no longer necessary, and my original amendment was altered so that on June 18—last Thursday—on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]

and myself, an amendment to section 9 of the Cordon bill was offered dealing with disposition of revenues derived from this outer shelf concerning which we are now in debate.

Mr. President, I was an original co-sponsor of the Holland bill and supported Senate Joint Resolution No. 13 all the way down the line.

I supported the States' rights position in this case because I believed in it—I believed that what the States brought with them into the Union still belonged to them, and for the Federal Government to come along after 160 years of legal lethargy and seek to strip them of those areas within their historic boundaries was, in my opinion, dead wrong.

At the same time, Mr. President, I see no justification in the extension of State sovereignty and earning power into the lands lying seaward of those historic boundaries for which the coastal States fought so long, so valiantly, and so successfully.

Those lands, in my judgment, are for the Federal Government to control in all respects because there are no States rights in the area which is now before us today.

I do not intend to argue the basic position of S. 1901 because I know that there are others on the committee and elsewhere who are better prepared to discuss this bill than am I.

But, Mr. President, to fully insure that no interest but the Federal interest be claimed in this outer-shelf area, it is my opinion that the funds derived from the development of the natural resources therein be earmarked for a specific purpose.

The junior Senator from New Jersey will not take the time of the Senate to go over the same ground covered so exhaustively by the proponents of the Hill amendment during the late and unlamented tidelands debate.

At that time the Senator from Alabama and his colleagues fully explained the drastic need for additional assistance for our school systems and the state of disrepair in which our whole educational system has increasingly found itself.

Our amendments, which I am asking the Senate to adopt to Senate bill 1901, earmark these funds for the purpose of easing our educational systems out of their present plight.

But the amendments specifically negate the possibility of Federal dictation to these State school systems. They remove from the troublesome area of Federal aid to education the disposal of these great resources.

The amendment sponsored by the Senator from Alabama, in my opinion, leaves for future legislation the decision about the manner in which the Federal Government shall parcel out to the school systems the vast wealth of the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. President, I have great respect for the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and his colleagues who have joined him in sponsoring his amendment, but I should like to suggest that I think he is putting the cart before the horse.

The problem of Federal aid to education has vexed the Congress for years, and it remains unsolved. It also vexes the States. I believe that the variation proposed by the amendments of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and myself to the basic amendment of the Senator from Alabama will do away with that problem. It will apportion these funds to the State school systems on the basis of the school population. I do not know of any other method by which the apportionment could be handled more fairly.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from New Jersey says he knows of no fairer method of distributing the funds to the schools. However, did not the aid-for-education bill which was passed by the Senate in the 81st Congress contain a formula by which the funds would have been distributed primarily on the basis of need? Only as a secondary matter would any of the funds have been distributed to the States on the basis of population.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is substantially correct. But if the Senator from Louisiana will consider the subject a little further, I think it will occur to him that for the most part the greatest need exists in the densely populated areas.

Mr. LONG. The facts available at that time showed that the State which would benefit the most on the basis of need was Mississippi, where the per capita income is only about one-third of that of the State of New Jersey for example. The State of Mississippi, which at that time needed aid the most, would have received the most help, because of the economic condition of its people, who were unable to provide for adequate education of their children, although the people of that State were taxing themselves at a very high rate for the purpose of education, considering what little they had to provide for that purpose.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I recognize the merit of the argument of the Senator from Louisiana, but I believe all the factors he has in mind have been considered in connection with other programs.

The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and myself provides a new and different program.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield further to me?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly yield.

Mr. LONG. When I was a senior in high school, I was able to become a member of the debating team. All that year we debated the question of Federal aid to education. During that time the affirmative always based its case upon the fact that there were some States which, because of the poverty of many of their people, were unable adequately to provide for the education of their children.

It was only recently that it was proposed that the wealthier States should receive Federal aid for education. Historically, the whole idea of Federal aid for education has been to help areas in

which the people were not able adequately to provide for the education of their children.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I can understand the Senator's point of view.

Mr. President, as I have said, I feel that the apportionment of this aid to the State school systems on the basis of population is the fairest way of solving the problem.

The amendment sponsored by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and myself avoids rigid formulas, prevents the Federal Government from exerting a dominant control over the standards to which States must comply in order to qualify for these funds, and removes from controversy the question of Federal aid to education.

Under the amendment which I am sponsoring, together with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Federal Government will become merely a clearinghouse for these sources of revenue. No new legislation would be required in order finally to resolve the problem which affects school children everywhere in the United States.

Section 9 (a) of our amendment is similar to the Hill proposal, in that this section provides that these Federal funds shall first be used for defense, during the present national emergency, unless the Congress provides otherwise. Thereafter the funds are to revert to the States, for educational purposes.

Under our amendment, it is true, the most populous States will receive the greater contributions because they have more schoolchildren.

But, Mr. President, these are not tax moneys; they are derived from national resources accruing to the entire country. If we are to assist our schoolchildren and at the same time if we are to remove the issue from politics, we must adopt a proposal which will prevent Federal dictation in the traditional State field of education.

Mr. President, the great majority of us supported Senate Joint Resolution 13 because we believed in the moral principle involved. There was much hue and cry over that measure. From a practical standpoint, I believe that by far the greater amount of natural wealth lies in the submerged lands seaward of the historic State boundaries.

In order to earmark these revenues so that they will be able to do the most good for the youth of the Nation, I urge the passage of Senate bill 1901, as amended by the amendment I have submitted, and in which the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has joined.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from New Jersey has presented this issue to the Senate in the way it should be considered. In other words, we now have the simple issue of whether we should dedicate to the cause of education some of the revenues from the last of the public domain.

Historically, the United States has given aid to education by means of land cessions to the States at the time when they were admitted to the Union. Now it is proposed that it be recognized that the Federal Government has a primary interest in the outer Continental Shelf.

In my opinion, the Senator from New Jersey has presented this issue to the Senate in the simplest possible way of getting it before us. The method he has proposed is certain to be understood, for it does not involve complicated formulas and questions of Federal aid to education.

The way in which the Senator from New Jersey has presented the amendment is quite analogous to the way in which I once offered a similar proposal in the House of Representatives, namely, to have the distribution of funds made on a per capita basis according to the school populations of the several States. In that way we shall avoid the various problems which arose at the time of the debate on Federal aid to education and the control of education.

So, Mr. President, as a result of the submission of the amendment by the Senator from New Jersey, the issue is simple and clear cut. I sincerely hope the amendment will be adopted.

In this connection, I may say that I have supported the proposal for Federal aid to education by means of the dedication of the income from this part of the public domain, in whatever form that issue has been presented, because I think it is a paramount issue. At the same time, I believe this program will receive the most widespread acceptance by the public if we proceed without involving complicated formulas or the possibility of control of education by the Federal Government or the possibility of dictation by the Federal Government to the States, in an effort to tell the States what they shall do with the funds. Let us turn over the funds to the States, and let us permit them to apportion the funds among the schools, for the benefit of the schoolchildren, on the same basis that the States handle their State revenues. Then the Federal Government will avoid any possibility of being charged with dictation in education, and will permit all educational matters to be handled by the people of the local communities, where such matters can best be handled under our public-school system.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is the intention of the acting majority leader to move a recess of the Senate, but I understand the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] has an amendment in the nature of a substitute he desires to offer, and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I had asked recognition for that purpose. I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the pending amendment, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25 of the bill, line 25, it is proposed to strike out the words "credited to miscellaneous receipts" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "applied to the payment of the principal of the national debt, except for the sums required for the payment of refunds under the provisions of section 10 of this act", and on page 26, lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to strike out "any moneys not otherwise appropriated" and insert in lieu thereof "money paid into

the Treasury under the provisions of section 9 of this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The last portion of the amendment, on page 26, lines 11 and 12, is identical with the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I am sorry, I was conferring with the Senator from South Dakota, and I did not hear the amendment read, so I am not prepared to comment on it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor. I yielded to the Senator from Texas. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota for the purpose of his asking a question of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, by courtesy, then, of the distinguished acting majority leader, I should like to ask the Senator from Texas, is it not true that the substitute which the Senator from Texas has offered embraces the text of the Hendrickson amendment, but adds thereto a provision which reserves a portion of the revenues to take care of certain refunds due to claimed receipts earned up to this time?

Mr. DANIEL. No; that is not the purpose of the amendment. The Hendrickson amendment also takes care of the funds for payment of refunds. I simply follow the Hendrickson amendment, employing the same words, saying that any payment of refunds under this bill shall be made first from the revenues received from leases under this bill.

The purpose of my amendment is to apply all the revenues received from leases under this bill to the principal of the national debt; and that is the way in which my amendment differs from the amendment offered by the distinguished Senators from New Jersey and South Dakota. Instead of the money going for Federal aid to education as under the pending amendment, my substitute would provide that it should go to the payment of the principal of the national debt.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey for the purpose of a question.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Under the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Texas, the revenues would go entirely and solely to meet the payments on the national debt. Is that not correct?

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct, except as to refunds of overpayments that must be returned to lessees under the provisions of the bill. With respect to the refunds that must be made, I follow the Senator's language.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Senator is referring to the outstanding and existing obligations, is he not?

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct. In other words, in the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, it is provided that any repayments or refunds should be made first before any aid goes to education, rather than paying the refunds out of the general revenue; and I fol-

low exactly the proposal of the Senator from New Jersey as to the source from which refunds or repayments shall be made, but provide that the balance shall be applied on the principal of the national debt.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, does the Senator from Texas desire to make a further explanation at this time?

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to make a further explanation, at a little more length, but I shall ask to be recognized for that purpose tomorrow.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a number of Senators have asked what the general program is to be.

I should like to point out to Members of the Senate that if we are to complete the rather limited program before the weekend of the 4th of July we shall have to make greater progress on legislation than we have made today.

It is the intention of the acting majority leader, for the remainder of this week, to have the Senate remain in session until a later hour than has been the custom. I do not mean by that, of course, an all-night session or a midnight session, but I believe that Senators should adjust their schedules so as to be prepared to be in attendance and to vote in sessions lasting until 9 or 10 o'clock.

If we are to complete the program, we shall have to make greater progress. It is the intention of the acting majority leader to continue moving ahead in connection with the pending legislation until it is disposed of by the Senate one way or the other. When the pending bill is out of the way, we shall take up the Interior Department appropriation bill. There has also been reported from the Committee on Appropriations the civil functions appropriations bill. I think the Senate should dispose of both of those bills before preparing for a Fourth of July weekend.

Furthermore, I should like to invite the attention of the minority leader and the minority Members to the fact that we were requested in the Policy Committee today to take up and consider Calendar Nos. 410, 411, and 412, being, respectively, Senate bill 1237, House bill 3853, and House bill 2313. I understand that with respect to all three bills there is an expiration date of June 30. Some of the bills deal with war powers legislation. I am informed that they do not entail major controversies. I hope not. In any event, those bills should be taken up and disposed of before the 30th of June.

If by chance the Senate Finance Committee should report a measure providing for the extension for 1 year of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, I hope that measure can be acted upon before the Fourth of July recess. Then it is proposed to proceed to the consideration of the mutual security bill.

There would be no intention, of course, to conclude consideration of the mutual security bill before the Friday preceding the Fourth of July. However, if the

Senate could make that much progress, the acting majority leader would be prepared to move on Thursday evening, July 2, that the Senate take a recess until Monday, July 6.

On the 6th of July it is my purpose to have the Senate consider the calendar of unobjected-to bills, beginning at the point where we left off on the last call of the calendar, with the understanding that there will be no vote on Monday, July 6, on whatever may happen to be the unfinished business on that day. In other words, assuming that the mutual security bill will be the unfinished business on that day, we will not take up amendments on the mutual security bill on Monday for the purpose of voting on them on that day.

I wish to reiterate that as routine conference reports come to the Senate—and such conference reports are privileged—the acting majority leader wants to be prepared to keep the business of the Senate moving along in an orderly procedure.

That would bring us to Tuesday. From Tuesday on I hope we will make sufficient progress so that votes may be expected at any time. From then to the end of the session every Senator should be on notice that on any day of the week the Senate may vote on either amendments or the bills themselves, by the yeas-and-nays or otherwise, and Senators should govern themselves accordingly.

I believe with such a general program in mind we will be able to reach the approximate adjournment date, or target date, which we have set, and to have made a substantial record of accomplishment in the first session of the 83d Congress for which both sides of the aisle, I believe, will be entitled to a fair amount of credit.

I have made this announcement because insofar as possible Senators should be advised of what the program of the Senate will be. We will, of course, take up as rapidly as they are ready, the subsequent appropriation bills, which must be passed before Congress adjourns, namely, the appropriation bills for Labor and Federal Security, the District of Columbia, Foreign Aid, Military, and Legislative. They will be taken up as they are reported by the committee and are ready for consideration.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President I have been asked, in connection with my prior statement, whether the Senate would meet on Friday of this week.

The Senate will meet on Friday of this week. The Friday to which I had reference was the Friday of the weekend of the Fourth of July.

Unless the Senate makes considerable progress, in addition to having night sessions during this week, to which I have already referred, the Senate may also have a Saturday session this week. I want Senators to be on notice, in the event we have not made sufficient progress.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask the distinguished majority leader whether he

given the Reclamation Bureau a better perspective and guidance from which the country has benefited. It was a trial-and-error operation by necessity, but the farmers of Nevada paid for those mistakes. Now they believe they have earned the right to own and control the project which their labors have purchased.

The Truckee-Carson irrigation district contracted with the Federal Government in December 1926, to become the operating agency of the Newlands' project and a repayment program was begun. Today the farmers have an outstanding indebtedness of less than \$300,000 owing to the Federal Government.

At a time in the near future when these farmers have repaid every dollar of the Government's investment, I believe those farmers should be given full ownership. Such would be to the best interests of the Federal Government. It would be divested of future expenses and the criteria of private enterprise from governmental investment would be served.

This legislation is not a Department of Interior bill although I am most hopeful that the Department will sanction its passage. My bill merely restates the demands of the people of my State.

I believe this bill truly represents democracy at work where the farmers themselves by their initiative and years of toil have repaid construction and interest costs to a Federal Government which envisioned the need for great reclamation development and used the State of Nevada and its farmers as the trial stage.

I believe it wholly consistent that Nevada as the site of the first reclamation project should also be the site of the first such project that the Federal Government returns to ownership and control of the people it was designed to serve.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DANIEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LONG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1901, *supra*, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 1901, *supra*, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. Long) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 1901, *supra*, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5376) making appropriations for civil functions ad-

ministered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 4, line 23, after the matter stricken out, insert the following: "Provided further, That funds appropriated herein may at the discretion and under the direction of the Chief of Engineers be used in payment to the accounts of the Confederate Tribes of the Yakima Reservation; the Confederate Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation; the Confederate Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation; or other recognized Indian tribes, and those individual Indians not enrolled in any recognized tribe, but who through domicile at or in the immediate vicinity of the reservoir and through custom and usage are found to have an equitable interest in the fishery, all of whose fishing rights and interests will be impaired by the Government incident to the construction, operation, or maintenance of the Dalles Dam, Columbia River, Wash. and Oreg., and must be subordinated thereto by agreement or litigation."

Mr. KNOWLAND also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5376, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nominations of Irving Salomon, of California, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Second Extraordinary Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and Mrs. Elizabeth E. Heffelfinger, of Minnesota, to be the Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Second Extraordinary Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. I give notice that these nominations will be considered by the Foreign Relations Committee after 6 days have expired in accordance with the committee rule.

WHEAT FOR PAKISTAN

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is about to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives, in which the concurrence of the Senate is requested, to Senate bill 2112, providing for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, although that is a privileged matter, I prefer not to have it called up until I have had a chance to notify the distinguished minority leader. Although the amendment of the House of Representatives itself makes no basic change in the bill, but is purely clarifying, I wish to give the minority leader an opportunity to look over the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the con-

sideration of a privileged matter, which is Senate bill 2112, to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, which has been amended by the House. It is noncontroversial, involving merely the matter of accepting the House amendment which adds only three words to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2112) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, which was, on page 3, line 9, after "the", where it appears the second time, insert "people of the."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the House has deliberated on this bill in the past 2 days and passed it yesterday with an amendment which adds three words to the bill. On page 3, paragraph (b), instead of reading "to give full and continuous publicity in Pakistan to the assistance furnished by the people of the United States," the amendment would make it read, "to give full and continuous publicity in Pakistan to the assistance furnished by the people of the United States."

The administration has no objection to the amendment, and I know of no objection to it. I, therefore, move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him before American Veterans of World War II convention in Beloit, Wis., June 20, 1953.

Commencement address delivered by Senator CARLSON at Springfield College, Springfield, Mass., June 14, 1953.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Article entitled "New Dealers' Fifth Column Wired to Jobs," written by Walter Trohan and published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 11, 1953, relating to socialistic thinking and attitudes among certain Government employees.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

Statement prepared by him entitled "Circulation Building Through Smear."

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Resolution adopted by the Memphis and Shelby County Council of Civic Clubs and an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of June 10, regarding the importance of keeping TVA in operation at maximum efficiency.

CONTINUED HIGH TAXES NECESSARY TO BALANCE BUDGET

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the deficit for the year ending June 30, 1953, was estimated at \$5.9 billion. I confidently predict, however, that next week, when the books of the Government close for the fiscal year, the deficit will be close to \$9 billion, an increase of \$3 billion above the estimate.

This will result from the alarming decline in revenue. Receipts for the current fiscal year were estimated at \$68.7 billion. They will actually be around \$66 billion, a reduction of \$2.7 billion or more.

"acts", to strike out "of the kind giving" and to insert "which would give."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, my next amendment is on page 4, line 17, after the word "acts", to strike out "of the kind giving" and to insert "which would give."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks, an explanation of the amendments which have just been agreed to.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER OF MARYLAND

The following three amendments to committee amendments have as their purpose a reservation to Congress of the right to terminate the period during which the extended penalties and offenses provided under this bill shall be in force.

The committee amendment purports to reserve such a right to the Congress, to be exercised by joint resolution. But this is in fact no reservation at all, since the Congress at any time, by an act approved by the President, could effectuate this result. By changing the word "joint" to "concurrent," it would be provided that the Congress might effectuate this termination by concurrent resolution, which would not require approval of the President.

In this connection, it should be noted, as a part of the legislative history, that this is not a case where Congress is attempting to reserve to itself the right to accomplish a legislative act by some process less than legislation. This is only a situation in which Congress is providing for a contingency which shall mark the termination of a temporary period.

The accompanying three amendments are identical in language, but would be made at different places in the bill.

The purpose of these amendments is to eliminate uncertainty with respect to what would constitute an offense under one of the provisions of the bill. The present language of the bill is borrowed from the emergency powers continuation act. However, that act dealt with continuation of a large number of different statutory enactments, and there was, therefore, some justification for using general language in that act. The present bill deals specifically with two sections of the criminal code. To provide that acts of the kind giving rise to legal consequences and penalties under these sections shall themselves be criminal is to be so lacking in clarity and exactness as to run the risk of having the penalty provision declared ineffective and void for lack of certainty. The proposed amendments do not change the intent of the bill in any way, but do entirely eliminate the danger of having the sections declared void for lack of certainty.

This amendment accomplishes the purpose of the language contained in the bill as reported but eliminates the uncertainty inherent in the reported language. This amendment accomplishes the extension of the section to defense activities in the same manner that was used in the Emergency Powers Extension Act, that is, by direct amendment of the sections affected, rather than by indirect amendment as proposed by the present language of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open for further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

INSPECTION AND AUDIT OF PLANTS, BOOKS, AND RECORDS, OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2313.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2313) to continue the effectiveness of the act of March 27, 1942, as extended relating to the inspection and audit of plants, books, and records of defense contractors, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER subsequently said: A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has Calendar No. 412, H. R. 2313 been passed?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It has been passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desired to ask a question with reference to it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana for the purpose of answering his question.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does the bill do other than extend the time?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It does nothing other than extend the time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I discussed the bill with the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It does nothing other than extend the time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] striking out on page 25, line 25, the words "credited to miscellaneous receipts," and inserting in lieu thereof certain other words.

The Senator from Texas is entitled to the floor.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me to permit me to make a brief address?

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to inquire how much time the Senator's address will require.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not think it will require more than 7 or 8 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized, with that understanding.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, do I have unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Tennessee without losing my right to the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, the Senate soon will begin considering the TVA appropriations, which are part of the independent offices appropriation bill.

It has been highly gratifying to me to have a number of my fellow Senators ask me what is involved in this issue. In other words, they are already giving it consideration. Therefore, although the Senate committee hearings have not yet been completed, I should like to take advantage of this opportunity to make a very brief summary of the principal issues regarding TVA, for the consideration of my fellow Senators. The issues will be debated fully upon the Senate floor at a later date. My effort today will be merely to present basic information concerning the TVA and to refer to some of the questions on which the debate will turn.

THE TVA IDEA

Mr. President, throughout the Tennessee Valley this year we are holding a series of celebrations to mark the 20th anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It was just 20 years ago that TVA was established in a region which then was at the bottom of the wheel economically. Today the picture is entirely different, and it is this difference that we set out to observe with appropriate celebrations all over the valley's seven States.

Our observance of this anniversary, however, is tinged with an increasing amount of foreboding, for during the past few months it has become increasingly evident that neither the idea nor the results nor the basic needs of this most successful of all Government operations are fully appreciated at the seat of Government today.

TVA is sometimes thought of as a Government power operation. It is that, but it is much more than that. Therefore, Mr. President, at the risk of being elemental to some, I should like to take just a few minutes to explain the TVA idea.

Francis Bacon wrote:

In order to master nature, we must first obey her.

The TVA idea was to take a river and a valley where nature frequently went on rampage and seek to master her. In order to do that, the entire region had to have a unified development program, for the rampages of nature do not result

amount of purchases by the distribution systems of copper, steel, and other products which the distribution systems must buy. It does not represent purchases by the people living in the Tennessee Valley, such as television sets, and all kinds of electrical equipment which are largely manufactured outside the valley. The purchases of fishing equipment in connection with the recreational features of the Tennessee Valley have added much to the business of manufacturing such equipment in various areas of the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is one other comment I should like to make, if I may, and that is that in traversing the area, which I frequently do, I have noted the immense improvement in conditions and the great degree of prosperity which prevails there, but I have not noticed any difference in that respect between the two congressional districts of the great State of Tennessee which I understand are traditionally Republican, and those districts which are Democratic. My question is this: Has there been any difference in the degree of support and of belief in TVA and its usefulness, from the political point of view, in Tennessee, between the persons who belong to one of the great parties and those who belong to the other great party?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator has asked a question which I am glad to have an opportunity to answer. Anyone who has ever visited the TVA region will agree that the TVA is one Federal agency in which political consideration has never played any part whatsoever. The TV Act provides that there shall be no political consideration, and the Board has scrupulously followed that procedure.

Mr. HOLLAND. Have not the headquarters of the TVA been located at Knoxville, which is not notable for its adherence to the Democratic cause?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. The headquarters are located in Knoxville—and properly so—in the Second District, which, ever since the War Between the States, has been represented in the Congress by a Republican as is the case with some parts of Virginia and of North Carolina. I think the unanimous opinion in favor of the Tennessee Valley Authority is shared equally by Democrats and Republicans in the area. Representatives REECE and BAKER of Tennessee and other Republicans have been just as vigorous in their support of TVA as have the Democrats.

Although the TVA employs a great many persons, I do not believe any Senator or Representative from the TVA area ever receives more than an occasional letter from a constituent asking any assistance in trying to help him secure employment with the Tennessee Valley Authority, because we know and they know that it is not operated on the basis of patronage in any sense.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have not raised the point of order, and I do not want to do so at this time. I understood, however, that the Senator from Texas yielded to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for a few minutes; but quite a substantial amount of time has been taken. I did not want to raise the point, but I was going to make an inquiry as to what the unanimous-consent request was which the Senator was about to make.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama for a question without the Senator from Texas losing the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have some kind of understanding about the length of time desired by the Senator from Tennessee, because a number of inquiries have been made as to when the Senate would resume consideration of the unfinished business.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama assures me that his questions will be brief, and I give assurance that my answers will be brief.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee referred to the fact that there had been no politics in TVA. I was the Member of the House who introduced the TVA bill in that body, just as the late Senator Norris introduced the TVA bill in the Senate. I was a member of the committee of conference between the Senate and the House. One provision in the bill about which I had the greatest skepticism was the one prohibiting politics in TVA. Frankly, I did not know whether under our American democratic system there could be a Government agency entirely free of politics. However, 20 years' experience with TVA has demonstrated that there can be such an agency, because, surely, as the Senator from Tennessee has so well said, there has been no politics in any way, shape, fashion, or form in the TVA. The officers and employees have been hired, have been promoted, and have been kept in their offices, solely on the basis of merit, without any consideration whatsoever of politics. Likewise, the decisions and policies of the Board have been entirely free of politics.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the able Senator from Alabama for his statement. He is entirely correct. I believe that in both the Senate and the House TVA has very substantial support from the Republican side of the aisle. The TVA is considered on a nonpartisan basis.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] a few minutes ago asked if there was any difference in the treatment by TVA as between Republican and Democratic districts in Tennessee. The fact is that there are more dams and other installations in the two Republican districts than there are in any other part of the State. That is because those districts are the logical locations for them.

The TVA is a great agency, which has done much for the people of the Tennessee Valley, for the cause of national defense, and for the Nation. It is a great asset of the United States. It is a great example to the world of what a democracy can do.

I hope that the Committee on Appropriations will not stifle TVA or reduce funds for its development.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] in yielding to me.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4126) to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits, until July 1, 1954.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1839. An act to amend section 32 of the Fire and Casualty Act, so as to provide that an agent or solicitor may secure a license to solicit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia under that act without taking the prescribed examination if he is licensed under the Life Insurance Act; and S. 2032. An act to modernize the charter of Washington Gas Light Co., and for other purposes.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], striking out, on page 25, line 25, the words "credited to miscellaneous receipts" and inserting in lieu thereof certain other words.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I shall take only a few minutes to explain the amendment now pending before the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing to yield for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the distinguished majority leader, but my remarks will be brief.

Mr. President, I believe that any revenues derived from the Continental Shelf adjacent to coastal States should be divided, at least to some extent, with the coastal States. The coastal States need revenues with which to carry on their services to companies and to individuals who reside on shore but who work on the outer Continental Shelf. Oil companies operate trucks over our

highways and roads, and the employees likewise use our highways. The children of oil company personnel attend our schools; their aged employees receive old age pensions; and some of their employees receive hospitalization under certain conditions. The States render many valuable and expensive services on shore to those engaged in outer-shelf operations.

I believe that in all fairness the States should receive some percentage of the revenues, or at least have the right to tax the private lessees who operate on the outer Continental Shelf. However, I realize that is not the sentiment of a majority of the Members of Congress, and is not the sentiment of the President of the United States. Therefore, if revenues received from leases on the outer Continental Shelf are to be earmarked, I think there could be no better purpose for which they could be dedicated than for the payment on the principal of the national debt.

I realize that the proposals of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], as also of Senators who have associated themselves with the Senator from Alabama, are for a worthy cause. They provide that these funds shall be used for national defense purposes during the present emergency, and then for Federal aid to education. However, as I understand, the House of Representatives has never agreed upon a Federal aid to education bill. There has always been controversy about that subject. In the Senate there have been 2 or 3 different proposals as to how these funds should be applied to Federal aid to education. To say the least, there is considerable controversy as to how a Federal aid to education program should be handled, and a vast amount of legislation would be required to settle that controversy.

I think we would be helping the school-children of the United States just as much if we were to begin paying some dollars on the national debt, instead of leaving that debt for them and their children to pay. The United States has a tremendous national debt, larger than the national debts of all the other nations of the world combined. In my opinion, this may be the only opportunity the United States Senate will have at this session to begin paying some money on the principal of the national debt. That is what my amendment would do. It would provide that all revenues received from leases on the outer Continental Shelf shall be applied to payment of principal of the national debt.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending Daniel amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], for himself and other Senators, proposes, in lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the Daniel amendment, to insert the following: "held in a special account and, except for the payment of refunds under the provisions of section 10 of this

act, such moneys shall be appropriated exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education: *Provided, however*, That during the present national emergency, but not for more than 3 years, the moneys in such special account may be appropriated for such urgent developments essential to the national defense as the Congress may determine."

On page 26, lines 11 and 12, strike out of subsection (a) of section 10 the words "not otherwise appropriated" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "in the special account established under section 9 of this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, for himself and other Senators, to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HILL. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Am I correct in my understanding that the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is a perfecting amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Then, if the amendment or the substitute offered by the Senator from Alabama fails, the vote comes on the perfecting amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote would come on the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is my understanding. Do I understand correctly that following that, the vote would come on my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If no other perfecting amendment were proposed, that would be the procedure.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama may proceed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have offered my amendment for myself and for Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. NEELY, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HENNING, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. CASE, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WILEY, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. SLYMINGTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. MONRONEY, and Mr. McCLELLAN.

The amendment has the endorsement and strong support of the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, the American Federation of Teachers, the American Library Association, the American Vocational Association, the National Grange, the National Farmers' Union, the Co-op League of the United States, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, 23 of the

railroad brotherhood organizations, and many other fine organizations. Altogether, some 40 great national organizations endorse the amendment and urge its adoption by the Senate.

The amendment recognizes the vital importance from the standpoint of the strength and security of our country, of meeting today's crisis in American education by providing that income from the development of outer Continental Shelf lands shall be appropriated as grants-in-aid to primary, secondary, and higher education. In other words, following the precedent set many times in the past of using the returns from the public domain for education in the States and throughout the United States, the amendment proposes that the revenue derived from submerged lands, a part of the great public domain, be used for educational purposes, for primary, secondary, and higher education.

With a consciousness of the present critical world situation, we have provided in our amendment that during the present national emergency, but not to exceed a period of 3 years, the funds may be appropriated for such urgent developments essential to the national defense as Congress may determine.

We could make no greater contribution toward the payment of the national debt than by meeting the present crisis in American education, by providing better opportunities for education, more nearly equal opportunities, greater opportunities for our children. Such a program would increase the productive capacity and enlarge and strengthen the economy of our country in direct proportion to what we do to provide better training and education for our children, the future citizens of America. We can make no greater contribution toward the payment of the public debt than by educating and training our children, by training more engineers, more scientists, and more technicians of every kind, of which there is such a terrible shortage today. This would increase the productive capacity of the country, strengthen the economy, and make it more possible to pay the public debt.

Mr. President, I have said many times that it may be very difficult, if not impossible, for the free world to match the Communist world in terms of manpower. Of course, we all pray for the time when, without global war and by peaceful means, we may witness the liberation of those who are held in the bondage of totalitarian communism, but such a day may be long in coming, and as the struggle proceeds for the minds of men we must pit quality against quantity. The basic strength of the free world lies in the fact that free institutions, unlike the institutions of dictatorships, are capable of developing men and women with intelligence, with initiative, with originality, with discrimination, and with inquiring and adventurous minds.

OUR HERITAGE OF EDUCATION

That we have in so many respects outstripped the world technically and managerially is due in large part to our system of free education developed under free institutions. This was the essence of the American dream as it matured in

the great creative mind of Thomas Jefferson, and along with it grew and developed the traditional American policy of dedicating the proceeds of our public lands to the cause of education, a policy which we would now follow in dedicating the submerged lands under the sea to the cause of education.

Thomas Jefferson declared "that nation which expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization expects that which never was and never will be."

At various times on the floor of the Senate I have tried to indicate that our precious heritage of education for all our people was in danger of becoming a myth. I have cited the dilapidated condition of our schools, the huge increases in our child population, and the alarming exodus of our inadequately paid teachers from the teaching profession into better paying pursuits.

THE CRISIS IN EDUCATION

Our education system today faces a severe crisis.

The measures which we have taken to meet the crisis are not adequate. Competition with industry and defense-related jobs has taken many of the best teachers from the classrooms. Many communities are scraping the bottom of the barrel to get even inadequately prepared teachers. Too few young men and women today are going to our teachers colleges to prepare themselves for teaching, because they know that teachers are the lowest-paid group in the United States. Last year our teachers colleges and other colleges graduated less than 40 percent of the number of teachers needed to fill new teaching positions in our schools. Schools are not being built fast enough to meet the needs of a rapidly expanding enrollment. More than a million additional children entered the public schools last fall as compared with the year before. This rate of increase will continue for at least the next 6 years as the 1952 birth-rate was the all-time high. For 6 years we shall have each year an influx of 1 million additional children in our schools.

The education of 4 million children is being impaired because of inadequate buildings, poorly trained teachers, and double sessions or part-time instruction.

SHORTAGE OF SCHOOL BUILDINGS SEVERE

Now let us consider for a moment the shortage of school buildings.

In community after community, classrooms are so overcrowded as to make effective teaching almost impossible. School basements, apartment house basements, empty stores, garages, churches, and even trailers are being utilized to take care of the overflow. In one community, children were found to be attending class in a morgue. What a pleasant memory they will have of their alma mater. Even with the use of such facilities, many communities are having to resort to half-day and even third-day sessions to carry the load.

NEEDS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

We are also facing a critical situation in the field of higher education.

Almost all our 1,900 institutions of higher learning are in financial trouble, whether they are State institutions,

land-grant colleges, the large private universities, or the small colleges. A recent New York Times survey shows that 1 out of every 3 of our liberal-arts colleges is operating in the red.

Income from gifts and endowments is off sharply, as is student enrollment. Faculties have been reduced in many institutions. Some of them have begun to lower academic standards to keep their campuses open.

Completely aside from the question of the necessity for preparing our young men and women to be good citizens and to earn a livelihood, we are here posed with the question of providing for the future military security of our Nation, and the crisis in our educational system is already imperiling that security.

I shall not at this time review for the Senate the story of what happened when the Selective Service Act was put into effect during World War II, or what has happened in connection with the recent mobilization of armed forces for the Korean war. We know that during World War II more men were rejected for educational deficiencies by the selective service than the number of men who fought in combat divisions in the entire Pacific area during the period of World War II.

Even in the case of the mobilization for the Korean war, educational deficiencies have caused more rejections than all other disqualifying factors combined. In fact, in the very first year following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea more than 300,000 men were rejected because of illiteracy and educational deficiencies. Since that time the number has climbed higher and higher and higher.

The cold fact is that all the people in the United States are but 6 percent of the world population, and we cannot afford to neglect the education of a single person who is capable of receiving an education.

EDUCATION AND MOBILIZATION

The plain fact is that we need more specialists of every kind—more scientists, more chemists, more physicists, more doctors, more professional and business leaders, more agriculturists and more engineers and skilled workers.

The shortage of engineers and scientists is a source of growing anxiety for defense mobilization officials.

Defense officials have declared that to bring the United States to maximum military strength, there must be a tremendous acceleration in the training of scientists and engineers. They point out that a speedup in research and industrial technology is an integral part of the defense program and that, therefore, scientific development which normally would have been spread over a decade has had to be telescoped into less than half that time.

The Director of Defense Mobilization reports that—

Acute shortages are continuing among highly skilled professional, scientific, and technical workers needed in defense and essential civilian industries. Under full mobilization, the lack of such workers would be critical. There are now 61 occupations on the critical list for which demand is greater than supply. The numbers now enrolled in college courses or taking other types

of training are not sufficient to meet future needs.

The Engineering Manpower Commission of the Engineers Joint Council has warned that industrial production and expansion which the council said had been hampered for the past 2 years by a serious shortage of engineers and scientists will continue to be held back this year and will fail to attain full output of civilian and defense materials.

Voicing the same concern over the shortage of engineers, Mr. Maynard M. Boring, personnel manager of the General Electric Co. and a member of the American Society for Engineering Education, recently told an Armed Forces conference that, if the shortage in industry continues, defense contracts might have to be extended or canceled.

He said that a survey group in studying demand had questioned 357 industrial companies and Government agencies and found that the country was short about 40,000 engineers.

To understand the tremendously increased demand for engineers, we have but to note, for example, that the construction of a B-17 bomber in World War II took 350,000 engineer man-hours, whereas today the construction of a B-36, which is not our latest, but is perhaps our largest bomber, takes exactly 10 times as many man-hours, namely 3,500,000 man-hours.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama to yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. HILL. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from California for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Atken	Gore	Maybank
Anderson	Green	McCarran
Barrett	Griswold	McCarthy
Beall	Hayden	McClellan
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bricker	Hennings	Monroney
Bush	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Kill	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Neely
Byrd	Holland	Eastore
Capehart	Hunt	Payne
Carlson	Jackson	Purtell
Case	Jenner	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kefauver	Smathers
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Symington
Ellender	Langer	Taft
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Flanders	Long	Watkins
Frear	Magnuson	Welker
George	Malone	Wiley
Gillette	Mansfield	Williams
Goldwater	Martin	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr.

BRIDGES], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. PORTER] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY FORMER PRESIDENT TRUMAN

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has learned that a distinguished visitor has arrived at the Capitol, the former President of the United States and former Senator from the State of Missouri, Mr. Truman.

The Chair appoints the acting majority leader, the Senator from California, and the minority leader, the Senator from Texas, as a committee to escort our distinguished visitor to his former seat in the Senate.

Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The committee appointed by the Vice President escorted Mr. Truman to his former seat in the Senate and he was greeted with prolonged applause, Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On behalf of Members on both sides of the aisle, the Chair desires to extend a very warm welcome to the former President of the United States and our former colleague in this body. The Chair would like to say, incidentally, he is sure that our distinguished visitor, upon his return to Washington, has noted many changes. Some of those changes he may not like so well as some of the others of us may like them. The Chair is certain, however, he will agree that on this June day the weather man has done one of the best jobs of recent history. At least in that respect there has been an improvement. [Applause.]

The Chair is sure, too, that all Members of the Senate would like to have a word of greeting from our former colleague and the former President of the United States; and, consequently, if he will so favor us, we would like to have it at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, distinguished Members of the greatest legislative body in the world, with one exception, the House, which is on a par with the Senate, I am highly pleased that the distinguished occupant of the chair

and Senators are so cordial and so courteous to me. I did not expect to have the privilege of the floor of this great legislative body when I came to the Capitol for lunch with the minority, but I appreciate it very much.

I think I have told you before that the happiest 10 years of my life were spent on the floor of the Senate. I used to sit in this seat; and I had a seat here for the simple reason that, when the going became too rough, there was always a way to get out. [Laughter.]

This body, of course, has great responsibilities. Its Members do not need to be told that by a former Senator. But it is up to this body to help keep the peace of the world. My ambition has always been to see peace in the world for all nations; and if that happens, it means peace and prosperity for our own Nation.

I have had a most wonderful experience in driving across the country as a chauffeur in an automobile—a privilege which I had not enjoyed for about 8 years. I had a very excellent governor in the car—not on it. [Laughter and applause.] Mrs. Truman watched the speedometer very carefully, and we arrived safely.

I express sincere appreciation for the courtesy which this body has extended to me. I have enjoyed it very much. [Applause, Senators rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled on being called to order by the Vice President.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when I offered my pending amendment, I called attention to the fact that there were 34 sponsors of the amendment, whose names I read. I now wish to add, as the 35th sponsor, the name of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. President, when the Senate paused in its labors to greet the former President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, I was speaking of the fact that we could make no greater contribution looking to the payment of the public debt than through the education and training of our children, because through their education and training we may hope to have, and we shall have, scientists, chemists, engineers, business, and professional people, agriculturalists, technicians, and skilled workers of all kinds who will give us greater productive capacity and an ever-expanding economy. Our best assurance of paying the debt is by having greater productive capacity and an expanding economy. I also addressed myself, Mr. President, to the question of the vital necessity of education to our national security and our national defense. I invited attention to the recent report of the Director

of Defense Mobilization made not many days ago, in which he said:

Acute shortages are continuing among highly skilled professional, scientific, and technical workers needed in defense and essential civilian industries. Under full mobilization, the lack of such workers would be critical. There are now 61 occupations on the critical list for which demand is greater than supply. The numbers now enrolled in college courses or taking other types of training are not sufficient to meet future needs.

Then, Mr. President, I invited attention to the fact that the Engineering Manpower Commission of the Engineers Joint Council has warned that industrial production and expansion, which the council said had been hampered for the past 2 years by a serious shortage of engineers and scientists, will, for the same reason, continue to be held back this year and will fail to obtain full output of civilian and defense materials.

Voicing the same concern over the shortage of engineers, Mr. Maynard M. Boring, personnel manager of the General Electric Co. and a member of the American Society for Engineering Education, recently told an Armed Forces conference that, if the shortage of such personnel in industry continues, defense contracts might have to be extended or canceled. He said that a survey group in studying demand had questioned 357 industrial companies and Government agencies and had found that the country was short approximately 40,000 engineers.

To understand the enormously increased demand for engineers, we have but to note, for example, that construction of a B-17 bomber—the bomber which we used over Japan and over Germany in World War II—took 350,000 engineer man-hours, whereas today a B-36 takes exactly 10 times as many man-hours—3,500,000. That gives us an idea of the terrific increase in the need and demand for engineers and technicians of all kinds.

Senators will recall the deep concern over our waste of manpower that was so recently voiced by Dr. John K. Norton, head of the department of educational administration, Columbia University, and former chairman of the Educational Policies Commission when President Eisenhower and Dr. Conant of Harvard were members of the Commission. Dr. Norton declared:

We have about a 50 percent educational system in the products it turns out and in the support it receives today.

He said further in his testimony before the committee:

More than half of the children who enter the first grade fail to finish high school. Perhaps even more important in terms of its effects upon our preparedness is the fact that only half of our top talent, those who get high marks in high school, who pass intelligence tests, who it is generally agreed could do college work and do it well, actually do so.

We are wasting one-half of our top talent in terms of giving them substantial professional, technical, or vocational training.

Mr. President, in the face of our failure to capitalize upon half the talent of our youth, to make the most of the talent

BRIDGES], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. PORTER] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY FORMER PRESIDENT TRUMAN

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has learned that a distinguished visitor has arrived at the Capitol, the former President of the United States and former Senator from the State of Missouri, Mr. Truman.

The Chair appoints the acting majority leader, the Senator from California, and the minority leader, the Senator from Texas, as a committee to escort our distinguished visitor to his former seat in the Senate.

Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The committee appointed by the Vice President escorted Mr. Truman to his former seat in the Senate and he was greeted with prolonged applause, Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On behalf of Members on both sides of the aisle, the Chair desires to extend a very warm welcome to the former President of the United States and our former colleague in this body. The Chair would like to say, incidentally, he is sure that our distinguished visitor, upon his return to Washington, has noted many changes. Some of those changes he may not like so well as some of the others of us may like them. The Chair is certain, however, he will agree that on this June day the weather man has done one of the best jobs of recent history. At least in that respect there has been an improvement. [Applause.]

The Chair is sure, too, that all Members of the Senate would like to have a word of greeting from our former colleague and the former President of the United States; and, consequently, if he will so favor us, we would like to have it at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, distinguished Members of the greatest legislative body in the world, with one exception, the House, which is on a par with the Senate, I am highly pleased that the distinguished occupant of the chair

and Senators are so cordial and so courteous to me. I did not expect to have the privilege of the floor of this great legislative body when I came to the Capitol for lunch with the minority, but I appreciate it very much.

I think I have told you before that the happiest 10 years of my life were spent on the floor of the Senate. I used to sit in this seat; and I had a seat here for the simple reason that, when the going became too rough, there was always a way to get out. [Laughter.]

This body, of course, has great responsibilities. Its Members do not need to be told that by a former Senator. But it is up to this body to help keep the peace of the world. My ambition has always been to see peace in the world for all nations; and if that happens, it means peace and prosperity for our own Nation.

I have had a most wonderful experience in driving across the country as a chauffeur in an automobile—a privilege which I had not enjoyed for about 8 years. I had a very excellent governor in the car—not on it. [Laughter and applause.] Mrs. Truman watched the speedometer very carefully, and we arrived safely.

I express sincere appreciation for the courtesy which this body has extended to me. I have enjoyed it very much. [Applause, Senators rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled on being called to order by the Vice President.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when I offered my pending amendment, I called attention to the fact that there were 34 sponsors of the amendment, whose names I read. I now wish to add, as the 35th sponsor, the name of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. President, when the Senate paused in its labors to greet the former President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, I was speaking of the fact that we could make no greater contribution looking to the payment of the public debt than through the education and training of our children, because through their education and training we may hope to have, and we shall have, scientists, chemists, engineers, business, and professional people, agriculturalists, technicians, and skilled workers of all kinds who will give us greater productive capacity and an ever-expanding economy. Our best assurance of paying the debt is by having greater productive capacity and an expanding economy. I also addressed myself, Mr. President, to the question of the vital necessity of education to our national security and our national defense. I invited attention to the recent report of the Director

of Defense Mobilization made not many days ago, in which he said:

Acute shortages are continuing among highly skilled professional, scientific, and technical workers needed in defense and essential civilian industries. Under full mobilization, the lack of such workers would be critical. There are now 61 occupations on the critical list for which demand is greater than supply. The numbers now enrolled in college courses or taking other types of training are not sufficient to meet future needs.

Then, Mr. President, I invited attention to the fact that the Engineering Manpower Commission of the Engineers Joint Council has warned that industrial production and expansion, which the council said had been hampered for the past 2 years by a serious shortage of engineers and scientists, will, for the same reason, continue to be held back this year and will fail to obtain full output of civilian and defense materials.

Voicing the same concern over the shortage of engineers, Mr. Maynard M. Boring, personnel manager of the General Electric Co. and a member of the American Society for Engineering Education, recently told an Armed Forces conference that, if the shortage of such personnel in industry continues, defense contracts might have to be extended or canceled. He said that a survey group in studying demand had questioned 357 industrial companies and Government agencies and had found that the country was short approximately 40,000 engineers.

To understand the enormously increased demand for engineers, we have but to note, for example, that construction of a B-17 bomber—the bomber which we used over Japan and over Germany in World War II—took 350,000 engineer man-hours, whereas today a B-36 takes exactly 10 times as many man-hours—3,500,000. That gives us an idea of the terrific increase in the need and demand for engineers and technicians of all kinds.

Senators will recall the deep concern over our waste of manpower that was so recently voiced by Dr. John K. Norton, head of the department of educational administration, Columbia University, and former chairman of the Educational Policies Commission when President Eisenhower and Dr. Conant of Harvard were members of the Commission. Dr. Norton declared:

We have about a 50 percent educational system in the products it turns out and in the support it receives today.

He said further in his testimony before the committee:

More than half of the children who enter the first grade fail to finish high school. Perhaps even more important in terms of its effects upon our preparedness is the fact that only half of our top talent, those who get high marks in high school, who pass intelligence tests, who it is generally agreed could do college work and do it well, actually do so.

We are wasting one-half of our top talent in terms of giving them substantial professional, technical, or vocational training.

Mr. President, in the face of our failure to capitalize upon half the talent of our youth, to make the most of the talent

which God Almighty has given our people, we know that ever since World War II, which has been 8 years, our intelligence sources have told us that Russia and her satellites have been working feverishly to train large numbers of scientists, engineers, technicians, and skilled workers of all kinds.

Doubtless the report of the extent of the Red educational effort is subject to the usual discounting, but Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, in his recent testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, warned that Russia is outstripping us in the training of scientists and engineers. Dr. Waterman told the committee:

In the year 1955 the estimate is that 50,000 engineering graduates will be produced in the Soviet Union, compared to some 17,000 in the United States. A similar situation exists in the United States with respect to the production of trained scientists of all types.

Dr. Waterman also said to the committee:

Our output of young scientists and engineers is now dropping to nearly one-third of the output in 1950, at a time when our research and development effort has approximately trebled.

I think Senators can well understand why there has been the great drop to one-third of the output in 1950. It is because the GI bill of rights has expired for the great bulk of the veterans of World War II. That means that many of our young people are not able to go to college. They are not in our colleges or universities. They are not able to educate or prepare themselves to be engineers, scientists, or technical workers.

The appalling waste of our human resources because of poor education or none at all is graphically pictured in a recent progress report of Columbia University's great research project known as the Conservation of Human Resources. Motivated by his wartime experience with manpower wastage in World War II, President Eisenhower initiated the project shortly after he became president of Columbia University.

The report is based on an exhaustive study of the poorly educated in military and civilian life. Let me read from it:

From the viewpoint of public policy, one general conclusion is unmistakable. If the United States wants to strengthen its military arm, if it desires to contribute to the heightened productivity of the economy—

I might interpolate: If we wish to pay off our national debt—

If it wants to buttress the foundations of American democracy, then it is incumbent upon the country to work for the eradication of illiteracy among the population. Its major attack must be directed toward the source which means the strengthening of elementary education, particularly in the poorer States.

The report concludes with this serious challenge to the Nation:

Only recently have we seen the problem for what it is. In the struggle in which the United States and the other free nations are currently engaged to maintain their way of life, our strength lies in the quality of our human resources—in the competence, imagination, and dedication of the population—not in sheer numbers. We can no longer ig-

nore the wastage of our human resources which results either from our failure to develop all latent potentials to the full or our failure to utilize them fully after they have been developed. For the welfare and security of the United States, in fact of the free world, have come to depend upon granting every individual citizen the opportunity for the full development and utilization of his human potentialities.

Let me conclude this portion of my statement by referring to the findings of another great body of experts on manpower resources—another body that was established by President Eisenhower himself while president of Columbia University—another action that was motivated by President Eisenhower's wartime experience with manpower shortages. President Eisenhower, while he was president of Columbia University, was so impressed, and, I may say, so challenged, by the crisis in education now facing our country that he not only appointed the commission to which I have just referred, but he appointed also a second commission, the National Manpower Council, composed of 17 members from among the Nation's foremost men and women in the fields of business, industry, labor, science, education, health, and government. The Council carried on its work at Columbia University with a grant from the Ford Foundation.

The objective of the exhaustive study by the Council was the evaluation of manpower problems of crucial concern in the United States in this period of continuing emergency.

All of us know that we are in a period of continuing emergency. Surely no one can say how long it may last. No one knows how many years it may continue or how long we may be under the threat, the danger, and the challenge that presents itself today, a challenge that goes to the very heart of the preservation of our country and its institutions.

It was 4 weeks ago yesterday that the National Manpower Council made its latest report and presented it to President Eisenhower, formerly president of Columbia University, now the Chief Executive of our Nation. Among other things, that report warns that our national security is now threatened because of our failure to build the full strength of our human resources, and the consequent severe shortages of engineers, scientists, teachers, doctors, nurses, and others with special skills.

The Council reported that the shortages of scientists and engineers—that are growing steadily more critical—have, in the Council's own words, "delayed defense production, slowed progress on research and development projects vital to our security and resulted in the production of some military items costly to operate and maintain."

In other words, we have failed to provide many of the essentials for our defense; and with respect to some of the things we have obtained, we have experienced great waste because we did not have trained, competent, adequate manpower to do the job.

The Council declared that our national security is weakened and our progress retarded by failure to provide proper education and training for "a

vast reservoir of highly intelligent young people."

As evidence of our waste of brainpower, the Council revealed that less than half of those capable of acquiring a college degree enter college, and 40 percent of those who start college—many with superior ability—do not graduate. The Council reported that "for every high school graduate who eventually earns a doctoral degree, there are 25 others who have the intellectual ability to achieve that degree but do not." They do not have the opportunity to do so.

Calling for more intensified efforts to improve elementary and secondary education, as well as education at the college level, and in the universities, the Council declared:

There is a hidden reservoir of brainpower that is composed of capable individuals who achieve low scores in tests of intellectual ability, primarily because of serious deficiencies in their early schooling.

They never get the foundation upon which to build.

The Council cited the tremendous demands of our research in atomic energy and electronics, and declared that in this age of science and technology "the security and progress of the country depend as never before upon the nurturing of creative minds that can push back the frontiers of the unknown."

We are reminded that several years ago Mr. Winston Churchill ascribed the fact that we had peace in the world to the atomic bomb. Where would we be today if we did not have the atomic bomb? How could we ever have got the bomb if we had not trained men to be physicists, chemists, engineers, and scientists, who could produce the bomb for us? Anyone who stops to think of the atomic bomb, or who rides in an airplane which takes him from Washington to Atlanta, Ga., the capital of the State of our good friend from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in 2 hours and 50 minutes; or anyone who sees a television program originating thousands of miles away, cannot help but know that we are living in an age of science. There is nothing more vital to our future and security and the preservation of our institutions than that we shall keep ahead of the game, keep ahead of our enemies. The only way we can do that is by training and preparation, by capitalizing upon the intellectual capacity which God Almighty has given to our children.

The Council made the basic observation that scientists and professional persons cannot be stockpiled like commodities against future shortages, and declared that "only a purposeful and sustained effort can insure that the United States will have adequate resources of scientific and professional manpower to meet its needs."

The reservoir of undeveloped brainpower and intellect—the latent genius that lies in the minds and hearts of American boys and girls—the reservoir to which the Council called the attention of the President, is precisely the same as that of which Dr. Norton spoke when, in testifying before the committee,

he declared that "we are wasting one-half of our top talent in terms of giving them substantial technical and vocational training."

The Council in its report to President Eisenhower referred to the "historic leadership of the Federal Government in the field of education." Let me read one paragraph from the report of the Council. It deals with the Morrill Act, the great land grant act of 1862. The Council said:

The most important, single governmental step in connection with the training of scientific and professional personnel was the Morrill Act of 1862, which laid the basis for the country's extensive State college and university system. This measure provided for grants of public land or land script to the States for the support of "at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and cultural studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts . . . to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes."

That is a quotation from the language of the Morrill Act. If we were writing it today we would perhaps use language a little more nearly in terms of the atomic bomb and the other great inventions with which our distinguished friend from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], former chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, is so familiar.

The Council continues:

The State universities and land-grant colleges have provided low-cost education, have contributed to the supply of specialized manpower, and have stimulated by their example the development of other scientific, technological, and graduate schools.

Despite the record amount spent for schools this year, in terms of 1953 dollars, the percentage of national income which goes for public elementary and secondary schools is considerably lower than it was 20 years ago. We are spending for such schools less today than we spent 20 years ago, before we moved into the great technological and scientific age, with all its dangers, threats, and challenges. With this record can we honestly say that our pride in education, our respect for the teaching profession, our concern for our children, and our zeal to preserve our freedom, are all that we claim them to be?

I wish to emphasize that the pending amendment, the oil-for-education amendment, sponsored now by 35 Members of this body, proposes no new departure into uncharted seas. It is simply a continuation of one of our oldest and wisest national policies—the use of public lands and the revenues therefrom for educational purposes, for the benefit of the entire Nation.

Benefits accruing to the Nation from this fruitful and far-sighted policy of educational endowment have been great beyond measure. The grant of 175 million acres for primary, secondary, and higher education has been called the "endowment magnificent."

Indeed, it has given us the intellectual and scientific competence by which our Nation solves its productive problems to a degree never approached by any other nation.

Dr. Norton, chairman of the Educational Policies Commission when President Eisenhower was a member of that commission, declared that the land grants constituted "the greatest gift to the development of education in the history of the whole world."

Then he went on to say that enactment of legislation of the type proposed by the pending amendment "would represent an exhibition of statesmanship equivalent to what was done in 1785, 1787, 1862, and the other great landmarks in the leadership of the Federal Government in developing education in this country."

We do not suggest that the oil-for-education proposal will prove a cure-all for every ill and every need that vexes our educational institutions, but we do feel that the revenues which will eventuate from the development of these resources can contribute importantly to meeting the needs—to giving to our "50 percent" school system a degree of perfection hitherto undreamed of.

Here is a windfall for easing the financial straits of our elementary and secondary schools, for providing more and better paid and better trained teachers, and for building desperately needed classrooms.

Here is an opportunity, a bonanza for relieving the agonizing difficulties of colleges and universities, medical schools, dental schools, nursing schools, technological schools, and research institutions with scholarships and grants-in-aid for specific training and research projects. The possibilities challenge the imagination.

Let us recall the words of that great Frenchman, L'Enfant, whose genius turned a swamp into the most beautiful of all American cities—the city of Washington. We remember that he said:

Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood.

The use of public lands resources set us on the road to realizing the dream of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, and other statesmen of our early history of a great system for the dissemination of knowledge. The challenge to this generation and to this committee is that we have the wisdom to use similar resources to give to that system the high standards of quality that they envisioned.

Let us not be less wise and foresighted than those early statesmen, who seized similar opportunities with respect to the then great public domain, and let us dedicate these great remaining natural resources to the furtherance of education, for the benefit of our country and of succeeding generations, as well as our own generation.

Here we have a magnificent opportunity to carry on the great American tradition of providing for the education of our children, of strengthening the well-springs of our democracy, of following the policy established by the Founding Fathers, of dedicating great natural resources for the development of our precious human resources, the children of the Nation, and of building America strong that we may keep America free.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Washington for a question.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to take this opportunity of congratulating the distinguished Senator from Alabama for making such a fine statement on the floor of the Senate this afternoon on behalf of the great human resources of America, namely, its schoolchildren. I do not know of a better purpose to which we could put our natural resources than to use them to help preserve, conserve, and better the human resources of America.

I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama for the long fight he has waged over the years in behalf of the program of utilizing a portion of the Nation's natural resources in behalf of the schoolchildren of America.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Washington, than whom no one has been more devoted or more active in his support of the pending amendment, the oil-for-education amendment. From the very beginning he has been one of the most enthusiastic and one of the most devoted supporters of this amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Alabama on what I believe he is doing through this amendment, if the resources in these submerged lands prove highly profitable, and that is, in putting first things first.

There is no way to pay the national debt or to maintain the vast and specific character of government which we have developed in this country, from necessity or otherwise, except through a constantly expanding economy. There is no way to keep it constantly expanding except through the education of the people, from the ground up. I think that is especially true in a period when we are, if not exhausting, certainly diminishing our natural resources, and when skilled and highly technically trained men and women are the real future hope of this Nation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Georgia for his very kind and generous words. We all know the authority with which he speaks. We all recognize and appreciate his great wisdom, his unwavering devotion to the public welfare, and his magnificent leadership, and we also recognize him as the author of one of the great landmarks in educational legislation in the history of our country, that great piece of legislation, the George-Dean Act, providing for Federal encouragement and assistance for vocational education. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama for his eloquent and moving address in behalf of devoting the proceeds from the oil, which we hope will come from the under-seas territory, to the great use of educa-

tion. The long and earnest fight he has made to devote the proceeds of this last frontier, perhaps, of public lands to better the education of the children of the Nation will long be remembered in our history. I am proud to be associated with the distinguished Senator from Alabama in the fight he is making for this amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, and I am proud to be associated with him in the sponsorship of the oil-for-education amendment. I know how faithfully he has worked for and how loyally he has supported the amendment. I, for one, have deep appreciation for the fine support he has given to this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in expressing my appreciation to the Senator from Alabama for the magnificent work he has done in promoting this cause. The Senator from Alabama took hold of the issue some years ago when no one thought it had a chance of success. It has been because of his devotion and his intelligent direction that it has been brought so close to success, with the vote today largely determining what the precise issue shall be.

The whole country is indebted to the Senator from Alabama. I know I express the feelings of a very large portion of the heartland of America when I say we are very grateful.

There is one other feature I should like to mention about which the Senator from Alabama has been very careful. I refer to the fact that the Senator from Alabama, who has been so active in furthering the cause of education, appreciates the complexity of this issue and realizes there is no simple formula by which Federal funds may be distributed. He realizes that the relative needs of the localities should be taken into account. He also realizes the importance of the public and private school issue and that we should be fair to both groups.

So I wish to commend the Senator from Alabama for the mixture of daring and caution which has always characterized his political life and which he evidences in very high degree this afternoon. I hope we may follow him, not only in his devotion but also in his caution.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I only hope that in some small degree I may measure up to his very generous words.

He is one of the original sponsors of the amendment. Time and again he and I have worked together; we have spoken together; we have spoken on the radio and on television in behalf of this proposal. For the past 2 years we have done all we could to assure the adoption of the amendment. No one could be more devoted or more active in behalf of the amendment than the Senator from Illinois has been.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. In a moment I shall seek recognition in my own right, in order to make some remarks on this subject; but I cannot refrain from expressing my extreme gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, not only for the magnificent speech he has just delivered, but for his leadership during the years. I have had the privilege of knowing the senior Senator from Alabama for a very long time, both in the Senate and for years before I came to the Senate. I think he is generally recognized in the Senate and in the country at large as the leader in the fight for the development of education, the development of research, the development of health services and facilities, and in connection with many of the collateral issues. He has done a magnificent job for all those things. I wish him to know that I am proud and happy to recognize, as I have for the 4 years I have been a Member of the Senate, his wise and inspirational leadership in all these fields. I intend to continue to follow him in that leadership.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for his very kind and gracious words. Let me say that he was almost an Alabamian; all his brothers and sisters were born in my home city in Montgomery, Ala.; and certainly through no fault of his own, his very eminent father and good mother left Montgomery and went to New York. But for that untoward circumstance, he and I would be fellow Montgomerians and fellow Alabamians.

Let me also say that the distinguished Senator from New York was one of the original sponsors of the amendment. No one has done more to bring about the adoption of the amendment than has the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. President, in a moment I shall yield the floor.

At the beginning of my remarks, I stated I would place in the RECORD the names of some 40 organizations, including the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, the American Federation of Teachers, the American Library Association, the American Vocational Association, the National Grange, the National Farmers' Union, the Cooperative League of the United States of America, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and many other fine organizations. I now ask unanimous consent that the list of organizations be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The National Education Association; the American Council on Education; the American Federation of Teachers; the American Library Association; the American Vocational Association; the National Grange; the National Farmers Union; the Co-op League of the United States of America; the American Federation of Labor; the Congress of Indus-

trial Organizations; the Oil Workers International Union; the Communications Workers of America; the Textile Workers Union of America; the United Mine Workers; the United Automobile Workers; the Friends Committee on National Legislation; Americans for Democratic Action; Students for Democratic Action; the Consumers Cooperative Association; the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees; Switchmen's Union of North America; the Order of Railroad Telegraphers; Brotherhood of Railway Clerks; American Train Dispatchers' Association; International Association of Machinists; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers; International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America; Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; Railroad Yardmasters of America; Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; Hotel and Restaurant Employees' and Bartenders' International Union, National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America; National Marine Engineers' Association; International Longshoremen's Association; the Order of Railway Conductors; the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; and the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastics Workers.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Before asking my question, I wish to join in paying the very highest tribute to the Senator from Alabama for his enlightened leadership in the cause of doing something substantial for education in the Nation.

Several persons to whom I have talked about the amendment fear that even if in the beginning the funds are earmarked for education, later demand might be made to have the funds used for some other purpose, and the funds might gradually be whittled away, by being taken from the cause of education and used for some unrelated purpose.

Has not it been the experience under the Morrill Act that there has been strict use of the funds coming from the sale of public lands for the purposes set forth in that act, and does not the Senator believe the funds we are now dealing with would follow the same course?

Mr. HILL. I feel confident they would follow the same course. There has been no deviation at all from the dedications which have been made not only in the Morrill Act but in many other acts even before there was a Federal Union—for instance, in 1785 and 1787. Whenever there has been a dedication of funds for education, that dedication has been scrupulously observed and carried out by Congress. So I am certain that Congress will continue to take that attitude.

Furthermore, the Senator from Tennessee knows that the people at home, whom we have the honor and privilege of representing here, are very conscious of the importance of this matter.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the fact that there has been no deviation from the dedication of funds for education,

bear testimony to the support that dedication of public funds for education has received from the people, and to the wisdom of such dedication, for if it were not a wise dedication, there would be considerable agitation for diversion of the funds to some other use. Is not that correct?

Mr. HILL. That is entirely correct.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Senator from Tennessee is one of the original sponsors of the amendment, and certainly he has been undeviating in his loyalty to the amendment and in his support of it. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, during my remarks I referred to the testimony of Dr. John K. Norton, head of the department of educational administration, of Columbia University, and chairman of the Educational Policy Commission when President Eisenhower and Dr. Conant were members of the Commission. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, excerpts from the testimony of Dr. Norton.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN K. NORTON, HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Dr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to make it clear first that I am not a lawyer and do not feel competent to go into these legal questions which have been discussed in such an interesting manner here this morning. I want to speak, rather, to a question of general policy, which is involved in a part of the Hill amendment here, in which certain of these funds might eventually be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

I realize that there are a large number of considerations that enter into the decision affecting policy in this matter. I want to speak only as it affects education, the possible relationship of this whole question to the proper financing and operation of education in a period of national danger, and, furthermore, to point out the relation of good schools to national preparedness and national security.

I do not think I need to dwell upon the matter which we are more and more recognizing, that this is a dangerous period in which we live. I will merely say that it behooves all of us, the whole Nation, to be strong, strong internally and strong with reference to ability to resist outside aggression, or, we hope, even to prevent outside aggression.

I would suggest that one of the essential ingredients of that strength, both internal strength and strength to resist or prevent aggression, is good education for everybody.

The fact is that we do not have good education for everybody in this country today. If I were to make the best estimate I could—and this is on the basis of over 30 years of very careful study and intimate association with public education in this country—I think I would say that we have about a 50-percent educational system in the products it turns out and in the support which it receives today. I will give you some facts on that in just a moment.

May I add, parenthetically, I do not think we can any longer afford the luxury of a 50-percent educational system in the kind of world we live in.

What are some of the facts behind this statement, which may be startling to some of you, that we have a 50-percent educational system in this country? I will point

out first the continuing—and I emphasize "continuing"—high rate of rejections of men called up in the draft. This has happened already in 3 wars since 1917. I suspect one of the reasons I am here testifying today is a most disillusioning experience which I had as a young man in the summer of 1917, when I went to one of the great Army camps and the men began coming into that camp. We were to examine them and classify them. At that time that particular camp consisted of some open fields and piles of lumber, and I might say complete disorganization for a good period of time. Some of you gentlemen remember that. Then the men began coming in, and I would not have believed what passed before my eyes day after day, week after week, month after month. Hundreds of thousands of young men, presumably at the age of the prime of life, completely illiterate, unable to write a letter home, unable to read a newspaper. That made an impression on me that I have never forgotten.

May I point out that something very similar happened in World War II. Apparently we learned very little from that experience. And the same thing is happening right now today.

May I point out, according to the figures for the last year available, 1950-51, 1,521,000 men were examined under selective service or the draft; 536,000, or 35.2 percent, were sent home as incompetent to defend their country. Those rejections were for various reasons.

I want to deal next only with the rejections for educational reasons. As I have just said, Senator, these over one-third rejections were due to every cause—physical, mental, educational. I want next to deal just with the clean-cut cases that were purely due to lack of education, denial of educational opportunity.

Under that head, we know that at least 16 percent or perhaps nearly 20 percent, certainly 16 percent, were rejected for the purely educational reason that they could not pass the Armed Forces qualification test, the AFQT, the same test which was formerly called the Army general classification test. This particular test is not a test of physique or mental stability. It is a test of having had an educational opportunity or of not having had an educational opportunity.

We know from the studies that have been made over recent years and recently that men with little or no schooling generally fail this test. The fact is that a considerable number of our children get no schooling in this country still. We know also that if they had a reasonable amount of schooling they nearly always pass the test.

We know, second, that the men from States with the better-supported, better-organized school systems have a very small number of rejections, and the States that have the school systems that are far below a reasonable level of support have a very high percentage of rejections.

For example, the seven States with the poorest provision of education had over half of their men rejected in connection with selective service during World War II.

FACTS CONCERNING MEN REJECTED FOR ALL CAUSES DURING WORLD WAR II, FOR ONE PERIOD SINCE WORLD WAR II, AND FOR EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

"The figures for the United States for the men examined under selective service and for rejectees as of August 1945 are: Examined, 17,684,700; rejected, 5,249,200.

"In the following States the rate of rejection for men examined under selective service for certain periods of time during World War II ran from 50 to 55 percent: Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.

"The foregoing 7 States ranked as follows among the 48 States as to expenditure per pupil for public schools in 1939-40 (48 being the State with lowest expenditure per pupil):

Alabama	46
Florida	37
Louisiana	39
Mississippi	43
North Carolina	43
South Carolina	45
Virginia	40

"The rejections for the foregoing States during the total period from November 1940 through December 1944 averaged between 40 and 50 percent.

"Data for a recent 18-month period, from July 1950, through December 1951, show that rejections of selective-service men ran from 48.2 to 62.3 percent for these States: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina.

"The foregoing figures for rejections are affected by a great variety of factors. For example, in some cases they tend to understate the percentage of rejections under selective service since they relate only to pre-induction rejections. Some men are eliminated after induction. On the other hand, these rejection figures refer only to men examined under selective service and do not take account of men who enlisted.

"The Research Division of the NEA recently reported a study of the correlation between expenditures per pupil and rejection for failure to meet educational standards as follows (note that this study is concerned only with rejections for failure to meet education standards as opposed to the figures above which deal with rejection for all reasons):

"The expenditure per pupil for the current operating costs of schools is a simple measure of what the States are doing in the way of providing educational opportunity for children. A study by the American Teachers Association showed a high coefficient of correlation ($r=0.86$) between the amount of money a State spent for education and the rate of rejections of registrants for failure to meet minimum education standards for military service in World War II."

"(As indicated in the foregoing a correlation of 0.86 is high. If the correspondence between expenditures and rejections was perfect the correlation would be 1.00.)

"Sources of figures"

"1. Periodic Reports of Physical Examinations. Summary and Detailed Reports, National Headquarters, Selective Service System.

"2. Summary of Registrant Examinations for Induction, Department of the Army, Office of Surgeon General, Medical Statistics Division.

"3. Statistics of State School Systems, 1939-40, United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency.

"4. Implications of Armed Forces Qualification Test Results for Education in the United States. Compiled by the Research Division, National Education Association, October 1952."

Dr. NORTON. I do not want to go into technical statistics, but the fact is that there is a 0.87 correlation—1.00 would be perfect—between level of support provided by the States and rejections or acceptance.

Putting it another way, a State that has a low level of educational support is nearly always, in fact always, found high in rejections, and vice versa. I will give you some general statistics. I took the five States that spend least for education, their average expenditure. All of them spend less than \$125 a year per pupil; some spend as little as \$80 to \$85. Considering just those 5 States at the bottom in educational support, there was not a 16 percent rejection, which is the national fig-

ure on this educational test, but a 42.2 percent rejection.

Let us look at the other level—the five States that spend most on education. All of them spend more than \$200; some up to \$300 or more. What is their rejection rate on the educational test alone; remember—7.1 percent. In other words, the rejections in the States with the least adequately financed schools are 6 times as high as the 5 States at the top with the best-financed schools.

During World War II, furthermore, the Army found that it was possible to salvage the functionally illiterate soldiers that it took on. They installed programs of education and 85 percent of the men who came in who were illiterate were sufficiently qualified in terms of ability to read and write so that they remained in the service.

A recent experience has been similar. I will come back to that point in a moment.

Furthermore, some improvement in education—very spotty, but some improvement in education—between the two wars permitted us to raise our score in education from being a fifth-grade nation to a seventh-grade nation. However, I do not think many of us would agree that that is adequate. I am speaking now in terms of averages. In the kind of world we live in we had better be better than a seventh-grade nation.

What are some of the causes back of this situation I have been describing—the fact that literally hundreds of thousands, millions, of young men show up at our Army camps almost completely lacking in mere ability to read and write and have missed practically all educational opportunity? I would say the first thing is that in this country as a whole we have never adequately supported education. At the present time the expenditures on the average for the whole country are about \$225 per pupil.

Our researches show that if you want to get a really good school system—even one that just barely goes on beyond the three R's and which gets all the children in school instead of just a part of them—you have to spend somewhere around \$400 per pupil. In fact, I suspect some of you gentlemen know what the typical private school charge is. Its rate typically begins at \$400 or \$500 and goes up to about \$1,000 when people really want good education.

I do not want to go into the details of our researches. I could cite a book recently issued by the Larson committee, the National Commission for Public Education, a chapter which reviews all the researches, which shows the relationship between the level of support and the quality of education. They show those researches universally, every one of them, show there is a very important relationship; and furthermore, that the majority of our schools in this country have not got to the place where they provide a first-rate education system.

The CHAIRMAN. Doctor, can you give a reason for that?

Dr. NORTON. I will give you some in just a moment. There is a whole series of reasons.

I will go back 20 years. During the depression we said we could not afford to educate our children, and we cut school support and school programs generally. To my mind, that was one of the most stupid decisions that we as a people ever made. We paid for it later, paid through the nose. We had to pay extra to educate many of these uneducated people during World War II.

Then came World War II. We had to put all of our resources into the winning of the war. I suppose we did. Anyway, we could not afford good schools because we were fighting a major war.

Then after World War II, we let inflation outrun school-supporting regularly. The adjustments made for changing eco-

nomic conditions were 2 or 3 years behind, as it affected the financing of education.

Now we are being told that with the enormous bill for preparedness—I guess we will all agree that it is enormous, and whether it is too much or not, I am not saying—we cannot afford schools.

In other words, in this period we have found easy excuses for shortchanging our children.

Now I want to go back to some of the other facts that bear on the statement that we have not adequately financed these schools.

There has been not only generally inadequate support, but the most unevenness and inequality of support, involving extreme inadequacy in many areas. I am not arguing that every State or every locality should spend the same amount for education, but I am willing to stand on the proposition that every American child, every child born in the United States or who comes into this country, should have an opportunity for at least a reasonable education. We are not providing that opportunity. I will give you the latest figures.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you call reasonable, Doctor?

Dr. NORTON. I would say any child who gets less than a \$200 education per year is being seriously shortchanged today.

The CHAIRMAN. The point I am trying to make is, do you mean that they should finish the 8th grade or the 12th grade, or where, in the educational system?

Dr. NORTON. I would say at least the 8th grade, but I would rather state it this way; I think every American child—of course, I leave out the very small percentage of institutional cases—but every normal American child, and 98 or 97 percent would be in that category, should be able to read and write. Every normal American child should have some understanding of the great heritage of this country, our freedoms, how they were won, the great men who established our country, and how we won the freedoms.

Every American child should have either some vocational education or at least some prevocational education given either in schools or else in cooperation with industry and labor.

I could go on and say that these minima in terms of qualifying as a citizen in a great country that has many problems to deal with, all of these should be provided every child. I state a low figure when I say \$200 per pupil.

Let me give you the figure as to what is really happening.

There were in 1949–50, the latest figures that I could get for the Nation as a whole and they are relatively about the same today, 200,000 children who are being educated in schools costing \$35 per pupil per year. In fact, there are 35,000 children being educated in schools costing \$6 and less per year.

Look at what this means. Suppose you have 30 children in a class; \$6 per pupil per year, \$180, with which to pay a teacher, to buy books, and supplies, to keep the school building up.

Do I need argue with you gentlemen that you cannot get anything like a decent educational opportunity for such a figure?

At the other extreme, we have tens of thousands of children who are getting an education costing \$400 a year and up.

One of the startling facts is that in this country, in which we make a lot of fine speeches about equality of opportunity—and I am for equality of opportunity—the fact is that our educational system is characterized by the greatest extremes in educational opportunity, ranging all the way from excellent school systems—I could name some that are costing \$600 or \$700 a year—down to situations in our educational slums where maybe children hardly ever get into a school or, if they do, they go just a brief

period of a few months for a few years and end up as functional illiterates.

This situation goes back to some of the things which we mentioned earlier when the Senator asked the questions, our easy complacency, but it also goes back to radical or sharp differences, disparities in ability to finance education. Within States those disparities are enormous, but as between States they are large. The poorer States have about one-half to one-third as much ability to finance education as the richer States.

So whatever you give as the causes—and there are others that could be mentioned—the fact is that we are short-changing millions of American children in what I would like to think is their fight to get a satisfactory educational opportunity, satisfactory in the terms which we mentioned just above.

That is the first point with reference to this 50 percent school system. I want to make a second point and point out a condition which again justifies this statement, which was perhaps startling to you, that we have a 50 percent school system.

I refer to the premature leaving, elimination from school. More than half of the children who enter at the first grade are eliminated before they get through high school. Perhaps even more important in terms of its effects on our preparedness is the fact that only half of our top talent, those who get high marks in high school, who pass intelligence tests and who it is generally agreed could do college work and do it well, actually go on.

There are various reasons for that, but one of the prime reasons is that their families are not able to finance the expensive college education. And college education is still expensive. Studies have been made in one State after another that confirm this fact.

Do we have too much well-trained manpower today? I would like to read you a paragraph from the report of the Director of Defense Mobilization dated January 1, 1953:

"Acute shortages are continuing among highly skilled professional, scientific, and technical workers needed in defense and essential civilian industries. Under full mobilization, the lack of such workers would be critical. There are now 61 occupations on the critical list for which demand is greater than supply. The numbers now enrolled in college courses or taking other types of training are not sufficient to meet future needs."

That, in a situation in which we are wasting one-half of our top talent in terms of giving them substantial professional, technical, or vocational training. In the future we will need those men, even if we assume continued peace or this cold war. If the worst should come, we would need them immediately and we would need them mightily.

If I may, I would like to point out a third factor which justifies the statement that we have a 50-percent school system.

Senator BARRETT. We are pretty close to the noon hour, Dr. Norton, and this might be a good point for us to recess, if it is agreeable to you.

Senator HILL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask, how long does the committee expect to recess?

Senator BARRETT. We will be in recess until 2:15 this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12 o'clock noon, a recess was taken until 2:15 p. m., of the same day.)

After recess

Senator BARRETT (presiding). The committee will come to order.

You may proceed, Dr. Norton.

STATEMENT OF JOHN K. NORTON, HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY—RESUMED

Dr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, you will remember this morning I had pointed out that many millions of the rank and file of our children are

getting something less than an adequate educational opportunity. I had also pointed out that we were capitalizing only about 50 percent of our top talent, and that all of these people are needed in this kind of world.

I want now to point out briefly some of the results, what I think can properly be called a period of financial malnutrition of education growing out of these circumstances we mentioned this morning, in which we always find a good excuse for doing something for education 10 or 15 years in the future.

One of them is the chronic shortage of qualified teachers. I don't know whether I need dwell upon that. We hear a lot about it, but, like Mark Twain's weather, we do very little about it. Back of that is the fact that teachers' salaries lost out seriously during a period of rising prices and inflation. While teachers' salaries only a little bit more than doubled between 1939 and 1952, wages in general went up $2\frac{1}{2}$ times. The average income of physicians, to select a professional group, went up 3.18.

The result is that in 1939, teachers on the average, with a salary of \$1,420, were 11 percent above the average wage of all wage and salary workers. They were not too much above, 11 percent, but they definitely were above the rank and file of workers in the country. By 1951, they were definitely below. Teachers were getting \$3,190 a year, and all wage and salary workers were getting \$3,253. Teachers were 2 percent below.

That has had a tremendous effect on our ability to hold good teachers and to recruit young people to come into the profession. This is not the only factor. There are some others that are very important.

In 1939, we were operating in a market where there was not nearly as high a rate of employment as there is now. We are now operating in a market of relatively full employment, as you know. Furthermore, one calling after another that did not use to be open to women is opening up to them. Teaching was about the only opportunity that women had some 20 or 30 years ago. Now they are going into one profession after another. The profession of nursing is developing. I do not need to develop that point.

Bright young women, to put it bluntly, can go other places to get recognition professionally and to get a good working wage.

Furthermore, another factor which came into the situation: Previous to 1939, teachers were exempt from the Federal income tax. I am not arguing that they should be. I always believe teachers should be full-fledged citizens. But the fact is that previous to 1939 they did not pay it; now they pay it. That is another differential against recruiting people into this calling.

The result of all this is that we have what is commonly called a shortage of 100,000 qualified teachers. Frankly, gentlemen, that is a complete underestimate, because the reason we have only a 100,000 shortage of qualified teachers is that so many States have dropped their standards down so low and by dropping their standards down low they can get some kind of person, frequently not very well qualified, to go in and hold down the classroom.

In this whole picture, really it is not the teachers that suffer. A lot of very good teachers have left the profession. A lot of bright young people who normally would have come into it have not come into it. Our teachers' colleges have a far smaller number of people than is needed to staff the teaching profession in the years just ahead. It is the children who are suffering, and that seems to me to be a matter that we cannot take lightly.

Now I will point out another illustration or result of this general financial malnutrition and finding good excuses for always putting education down low in the list of priorities. That is the lack of school buildings and other facilities. As you doubtless

know, we have had a great increase in school population, and it is growing every year. We put off building new school buildings in the 1930's. We could not build them in the war for reasons that you know. We are barely keeping up to the point where we were a few years ago by building as rapidly as we can today.

The result is many double sessions, where schoolhouses operate from 7 or 8 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock at night, and frequently oversized classes are necessary because there are not enough classrooms. You can always presumably stick in a few more chairs. You have 30 or 35 children already in a classroom. They come crowding in. You can shove in a few more until you have 40 or more. The effect of this, once again, on children is tragic.

I would like to read 3 or 4 lines from a recent report of the Educational Policies Commission, which represents the NEA and the American Council on Education, which is one of the chief representatives of higher education. It says:

"Overcrowded schools, with their part-time classes, overworked teachers, mass instruction, and watered-down programs produce effects which are not always immediately observable, but are nonetheless serious. Pupils do not learn the things they should, and they master less well the things they do learn. Relations between home and school are weakened."

A teacher with 40 children just cannot keep contact with the home. She just cannot treat each individual pupil as an individual. She has to teach them in masses.

"Relations between home and school are weakened, and the well-balanced development of children is prevented. Ingenious administrative arrangements to utilize every building to the limit are helpful, but they are no substitute for the careful ministrations of a teacher who has time to teach each child well. Fitness for freedom is not mass produced."

So we would emphasize that the shortage of teachers, the shortage of buildings and other facilities, is a major problem standing in the way of making our schools 100-percent effective.

Furthermore, the present prospects are that things will get worse before they get better. As you probably know, the annual crop of children, the seed corn of our Nation, is now about 4 million a year. It was $2\frac{1}{2}$ million in the 1930's. This increased birthrate began shortly after 1940. I do not need to go into the reasons. It is a fact. That crop of children at a 4-million level as opposed to about $2\frac{1}{2}$ million is about halfway up through the schools. It is at about the fifth, sixth, and seventh grades now. In the next 5, 6, or 7 years it is going clear through high school.

Incidentally, the high-school cost per pupil is higher than elementary. We are going to have the same pressure on teachers at the high-school level, the same need for more teachers there, the same need for new high-school buildings, that we are now feeling so severely at the secondary-school level.

Furthermore, the result of building so very few buildings from about 1930 to about 1945 is that many buildings are becoming obsolescent.

Furthermore, we have a very mobile population. The mobility of our population has greatly increased. It would be nice if we could use some of our partly empty school buildings, but frequently they are 10 or 20 or 30 miles away from where the children are. Many people, as you know, are leaving the great cities and going into the outer fringes of the cities. You have to make the choice between building new school buildings or transporting the children great distances, which is not desirable, and at considerable expense.

I mention these factors that I have described are not being corrected. They are actually becoming worse. Under present cir-

cumstances, they will become still worse in the next 5 or 6 years.

Now I want to go into a fourth factor bearing on this 50-percent school system that I mentioned. We recognize the necessity of military preparedness, but may I point out that full preparedness is more than just military preparedness. The worst thing we could do in this country would be to develop a Maginot-line psychology, with the idea if we get just enough bombs or tanks or battleships or planes, everything is all right. In fact, if we look back on the history of the world, it has been more often internal weaknesses rather than outside invasions that have resulted in the overthrow of great peoples.

I want to mention just one additional factor. I cannot develop this at great length. The economic factor. Wars are fought with the economy today quite as much as with armies. May I point out, second, that one of the crucial factors, one of the crucial ingredients of a strong nation economically is first-rate education.

I have a colleague at Columbia University who has literally visited, in the last 20 or 25 years, some 54 different countries to study the relation of education to the economic strength and well-being. The result of his studies—recently some of them were published on the front page and in other sections of the New York Times—shows 2 or 3 very striking things. One is that technology and education are the crucial factors in a strong, high level of productivity, a strong economy. Natural resources run a poor third.

If you will look around the world today, you will find many areas that are tremendously wealthy in natural resources in which the people are living in abject poverty. On the other hand, I could name countries which have relatively few, limited natural resources which, through the development of their economy and through the development of education throughout their people, technical education and all of that, have developed very high level economies. When you put the three together, when you apply science to industry, which is another way of expressing technology, when you give everybody education, good education, or a fairly good education and then if in addition you have natural resources, you get the United States, which has about twice as high an income per capita as even the wealthiest other nations.

We have capitalized education in this country to a certain extent, more than other countries, but still we have to come back to the conclusion that we have capitalized it only about 50 percent, even in this area, for reasons that I have given already.

We know that in our own country, once again it is not the States that are richest in natural resources that have the highest income. It is the States which over the century or century and a half that had the high education. If you look around the world you will not find any country that has achieved a strong economy without a lot of good education.

Instead of approaching this negatively, what would we do in our country if we made education 100 percent efficient economically in building up this essential ingredient of strength, of preparedness? Please understand, I know there is much more to education than a strong economy, but it is one important thing.

In the first place, we would give every child first-rate vocational and educational guidance. We would not be satisfied with just a bare elementary school education for anybody. We would send him on a considerable distance into high school. We would give him some acquaintance with his capacity in terms of what he could take in technical or professional education or education that only went part way or maybe all the way through high school. We would give him some knowledge of occupational trends,

where the overcrowding is and where there is a shortage.

I am ashamed to tell you that the typical youth who leaves our high school today does not get this at all. We give him some definite vocational training, or at least pre-vocational training, either in school or perhaps preferably in cooperation between the school and industry and labor, as is done in a few outstanding school systems. We would have a program for the smooth transition of youth from full-time school attendance to full-time occupational life.

Most communities have no such program. They shove the children out and let them sink or swim and, as you know, one of the high ages of juvenile delinquency is the years just after they are shoved out and are frequently marked as failures by our high schools.

I want to get to the point of the place where the Federal Government has been sticking its nose into education in a way that alarms me very seriously. I refer to the establishment in every one of the armed services of a substantial program of straight education. I am not limiting myself to military training, but every one of the armed services—listen to the radio, look at the enlistment posters, and let me read to you, if I may, from a recent report from an officer at one of our great Army cantonments. This is quoted verbatim:

"With draft laws in effect throughout the United States the Army is discovering that a considerable number of personnel have been brought into the service who are unable to absorb military training because of their inability to read and write English and to do simple arithmetical problems. For these men who have not had the opportunity for a formal education"—I am still quoting—"For these men who have not had the opportunity for a formal education the Army's Information and Education Section has instituted a basic educational program designed to relieve this situation."

So I will not be misunderstood, I am not criticizing the Army at all. I am just pointing out a fact.

Here I am quoting:

"Classes are held either morning or afternoon, Mondays through Fridays, for a period of 4 hours a day over a period of 25 days. At the end of this time the students take a United States Armed Forces Institute examination which covers their period of instruction."

Then it goes ahead and says if they don't pass it, they get a little more schooling.

Here is another very interesting paragraph, and I will quote it in the light of something we said a moment ago:

"Only top instructors are selected to give the instruction in the basic subjects, reading, writing, and arithmetic. Instructors are all State-certified teachers and experienced in adult-education problems."

Then it goes on again:

"Some idea of the vastness of this program may be grasped from the statistics of an experimental period."

Then it goes ahead and analyzes a number of youth being educated under this program.

As I said, I do not blame the Army, or the Navy, or the Air Force, or the Coast Guard in the least when they find young men who have not had a chance to get an education to give it to them. If I were in any of these services, I would do the same thing. But I urge upon you gentlemen that there is something wrong with a situation where that is necessary. This is not only Federal control of education, it is Federal operation of education. And far more, it is military administration of education. It is Federal education; it is military administration.

Let me point out if you were going to pick out any one part of our Federal Government,

the last one that should administer education is the armed services.

Why do I say that? Not that I have anything against military or naval men, but it is the one service that takes the men away from the locality. We think it is a good thing to keep education in the locality, to keep it in the States. But it takes them away from their homes. How do we know what goes on? It is probably all right, but look at it from the long-term point of view. Do we want as a permanent policy in this country to have the military services begin to pick up the pieces because of the inadequacy of the support and inadequacy of our educational program? I think you know the answer.

Dr. Norton. I think this whole development or trend—and please do not misunderstand me, I am making no argument against necessary military training. I think we would be completely foolish not to have military training in a period like this. But that is quite a different thing from an educational program under the military. It is not only bad general policy; if you will look up the figures and find out the cost per man of the education of these men who come into the service unprepared, you will find it is very expensive.

So I propose that there is a far better approach to this whole problem of dealing with our 50-percent educational system. I will sketch it briefly.

We ought to put a floor of support under all education. It should be impossible from the financial point of view for any child to live in a community where there is not enough money to educate him. We ought to have a program to capitalize the full possibilities of education in the field of vocational and technical training, and all of the other areas of education.

This would involve a pretty substantial thinking of the relation of education to our Nation in a period of great crisis and stress, a period that is not going to end tomorrow, from anything that we can see today. This program should be administered under State and local control.

Now, I am going to get into an argument, but I am going to say it without any qualification. This should be a cooperative program, financially and otherwise, that would involve the three levels of Government, the major control and management at the local level, some overall control from the State level, and no control from the Federal level but some Federal help.

May I point out that there is a justification for such a proposal. I want to give you just a few of the major justifications.

First, it would vastly increase our national security in terms of manpower, in terms of the quality of manpower. I do not think I need dwell on that further.

Second, it would be in accord with the historic American tradition as it concerns the very important role of leadership and financial help that the Federal Government has given to education since the very beginning of our Government.

Let us look at that just a moment. It is a noble tradition. We sometimes lose sight of the relation of the Federal Government to education. May I point out that Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, and many other great statesmen recognized the inescapable relationship between a society of freemen in a republic, the kind of government we were setting up, and education for everybody. They all made individual contributions. The program of education that Jefferson proposed we are just beginning to catch up with. You know, on that monument halfway up Monticello, he forgets to put on his epitaph that he was President of the United States, but he does put on it that he was the founder of the University of Virginia.

These great founders—and they were a remarkable group of men—the founders of

our Republic did not just talk about it. They did something about it. When it was being decided in the Continental Congress how we should deal with the great lands to the west, the first decision was that they were under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. The next thing that was decided was that they should be surveyed, and it was then decided that a part of the land in every township should be used for the development of a system of public education. Then this was repeated in the famous Ordinance of 1787, one of the noblest statements ever made. You find there:

"Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools, and the means of education shall forever be encouraged"—they did not say just encouraged by the State and locality—"encouraged by the Federal Government."

Let me read from a significant study that was made. I would say the outstanding study of this whole period, Mr. Taylor's. He says: "The national land grants were the very foundation of public education in the United States."

At another place he says:

"In some respects the policy of national grants for higher education was the most significant of our early land ordinances and established higher education in this country."

They not only said those fine things that I have quoted, but when the first State was admitted in 1802, they put that fine statement into operation, and the 16th section in every township was set aside for education.

A little later they added the 32d section. A little later they began to give funds, too.

If I may go a step further, in 1862 President Lincoln signed another historic act, bill, making it a law, which established eventually 69 A. and M. colleges that we have today. They not only established them, but they gave lands and later hard cash for the development of those colleges.

May I suggest that one of the reasons why we are the great agricultural Nation as well as industrial nation, that we are today is the vision that was represented by the Federal Government in establishing this great system of rural education, agricultural education, whatever you want to call it. It was expanded by the Hatch Act in 1887 to provide experimental stations, research, the famous Smith-Lever Act of 1914 for the extension service.

Once again we have in this action on the part of these various acts the greatest single illustration in the history of the world of the development of higher education. You cannot point to anything like it anywhere else in the history of the whole world that is equal to the leadership of the Federal Government in establishing 69 higher educational institutions, giving it a little money to start with, and then the States and localities took hold, and you know what a very important factor they are in our educational system.

I want to come to another great landmark in the leadership of the Federal Government. In 1917 there was passed what was commonly called the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act. At that time, although we had had some vocational education in this country, the amount was extremely limited. You know something about that act. It was later developed further under the George-Dean Act, and the George-Barden Act. But suffice it to say for the first time a considerable number of our high schools, under the encouragement and financial help of this act, began to take the technical and vocational training of our youth seriously. It was a fortunate thing they did, because when we came into World War II, in spite of the very fine work that had been done under the

Smith-Hughes Act, the matching and over-matching of funds by the States and localities, we still found we were lamentably short of trained persons. Some of you remember that the two kinds of buildings that you saw with lights burning in them 24 hours a day were the war factories and the schoolhouses, because many of them ran three 8-hour shifts in order to get enough trained people to carry on a great war.

So, we have here the establishment of one of the greatest programs of vocational education in the history of the world by the leadership of the Federal Government and with some financial help.

The States and localities have taken hold of that. They now put considerably more than the Federal Government puts into it, and they have virtual control over that, as they do of our public schools, as they do of the land-grant colleges. In other words, I have only hit, as you know, a few of the high points. There are some 44 major enactments of the Federal Government in the history of its relation to education. I have picked out only a few. I will sum it up in just a few words.

We really have a great tradition in the statesmen who have sat in our Congress who have seen that, whereas education is properly a matter of State control and local control, there is also a national interest in education. We are all weakened when a child is denied education, whether he lives in Maine or California or Florida or Washington or somewhere in between. We cannot afford to have 35 percent of our youth rejected for physical and educational deficiency. We cannot afford even to have 16 percent rejected for educational deficiency. We cannot afford to give education only to a half of our top talent. Maybe we could have afforded that luxury in the easy days when we thought the oceans protected us, but let us remember that we will be the first to be attacked if war ever breaks out again.

Let us remember, further, that we are a sort of little island of freedom in a world of hungry and illiterate people. One person in 16 in the world is an American. The totalitarian, the slave societies, outnumber us 5 to 1. May I suggest that this is something we need to think about: that every one of our sons, when he reaches 17, 18, 19, should be fully prepared, as far as good education will prepare him, for all of the duties of peace or war; that we ought to hand over to our military services not some good men plus a lot of illiterates and physical incompetents. We ought to hand over 100 percent of men to our military services, as near to 100 percent as we can make it, through good education.

So, I end this portion by saying I see in this situation a great opportunity for statesmanship, a great opportunity for leadership. Look back and see what our great forebears did even before we had our Constitution in 1785, 1787. Look what Lincoln and the great leaders did in 1862. Look what subsequent people did in developing the Morrill Acts. Look at what we did under Wilson's administration in 1917, and compare it, frankly, gentlemen, with what we are doing today for education.

DR. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, Could I add one point about our historical policy. When the Continental Congress and then the Federal Congress was confronted with this great issue of what to do with these public lands, I think we know that it took charge of their distribution and use, and wisely, as should have happened, most of them have passed into the hands of the States or into the hands of individuals, but there was one great act of statesmanship in that transfer which essentially founded our system of public elementary and secondary education and a good many of our State universities were started out of special land grants.

Against that background and without going into the legalities of this whole situation, I cannot look at a bill that is concerned with a great natural resource, the value of which we really do not know, although we can get estimates. I in no way wish to impugn what you said, Senator KUCHEL, but we really do not know in the long pull how much resource there is there.

Against the background of our policy, I must come to you at this time and say, Let us take time to look at this thing. Let us make no snap judgments. Let us consider all the questions of educational policy that are involved here as well as other questions. If you do that, I am perfectly willing to leave it to you gentlemen to decide it.

Senator BARRETT. Dr. Norton, you mentioned a moment ago that you had a colleague up at Columbia who was very interested in oceanic farming.

DR. NORTON. That is right.

Senator BARRETT. Would that be Professor Clark?

DR. NORTON. Yes, it would be; Prof. Harold Clark.

Senator BARRETT. He testified before this committee last week, and I might say to you that he went much further than any witness we have had before this committee by contending that not only submerged lands within the historic boundary of these States but, in addition to that, all of the lands beyond and out on the Continental Shelf should be surrendered to the States.

So it looks as if you and Professor Clark are in complete disagreement in that respect, anyway.

By the way, he, among all of these witnesses, assumes that there is terrific wealth in the lands in question, so he does not mean to say he is just giving away something of little or no value, because he thinks there is wealth far beyond the anticipations of all of the members of this committee.

DR. NORTON. I know Professor Clark quite well, and I know his viewpoint on this. I would add, incidentally, that one of the characteristics of a great university is people who honestly try to look at the facts and then draw their own conclusions. Dr. Clark has done some very interesting work. I admire a great deal of his work.

Senator BARRETT. He made a very fine statement. I will say.

DR. NORTON. I disagree with a number of the points he made in his testimony the other day. He happened to be enamored of the great State of Texas, and I do not blame him. It is a great State. He comes up here and he talks just like a Texan. [Laughter]

Senator BARRETT. I might say to you he is not a Texan. He is from the State of Kentucky.

DR. NORTON. I can tell you his history. He goes as fast as he can get away at vacation time, just as hotfooted as he can, to San Antonio, where his wife lives, and where he has lived when he had any free time ever since he married that charming lady.

Senator BARRETT. He told this committee that his own home State of Kentucky got all of the public domain within its borders when it came into the Union. That, of course, is a fact?

DR. NORTON. Upon decision of the Federal Government at the right time, yes.

DR. NORTON. May I say just one thing to deal with this question positively. I would be very happy to see the Federal Government in its ultimate disposition of the public lands in the West follow a policy which is as wise and statesmanlike as it has done in dealing with the public lands up to date.

Without repeating myself, I would point out that we have had a kind of Federal legislation affecting education that has been of tremendous value and significance, the early land grants, the Morrill Acts, the Smith-Hughes Act, and others. You notice there

is no control connected with any of those. That leadership with some financial help has been a major factor in shaping our great educational system.

I might surprise you by telling you that I am equally worried by and against the kind of piecemeal emergency, "hurry up, do something quick" legislation that this Congress—not this Congress, but Congress in general—has now been passing for some 20 or 25 years. We have waited until some pressure group, perhaps with needs that they think are significant, rushes in and asks for some kind of emergency legislation.

I could tell you about the story when I was first invited down here—I was invited only once—by Mr. Hopkins and Aubrey Williams. As soon as they found out I was for the kind of legislation that I thought was sound, I never was invited again. But we had the NYA. I said that is not the way to do it. It will not do anything for secondary education. Where is NYA now?

You can take one thing after another that I could mention in detail, and there have been 30 or 40 of them passed.

I am suggesting that the time is to stop, look, and listen. There is a great opportunity for just one piece of legislation that this Congress can pass that will have effects as great and tremendous as the original land grants, as the Morrill acts, and all these other acts.

That legislation in a few words would be something like this: What is an acceptable minimum of education for every American child? Let us keep our eye on the individual child. Let us not be led astray by specious arguments that the States ought to do it or any other argument. I have been hearing that argument for 35 years. Let us say we want every American child to have an opportunity.

The Federal Government has a relationship to that matter, which is a matter of national interest. It therefore sets up a minimum. It says to every State, "Contribute toward that minimum in terms of your capacity, and the Federal Government will supply the rest," a perfectly sound principle, as has been developed in our State financing and in even some of our Federal financing.

If we would do that, we could do education more good at less cost than all of these fly-by-night piecemeal, emergency bits of legislation that Congress has been playing with for the last 20 or 25 years.

Senator GOLDWATER. Do you believe the responsibility for this rests with the Federal Government or the States?

DR. NORTON. I believe the responsibility for education is a joint and cooperative one. It is a matter of distribution of function. The major responsibility for management, the actual running of the schools, should be with the locality. I think that is one of the great strengths of our educational system. The trouble is that our localities just do not have the wealth to do it alone.

Another important overall responsibility should be exercised by the States, and they are more and more doing that. Some 45 percent of all school support today comes from the States as opposed to the localities. But under present situations we have reached the point of diminishing returns. We can somewhat hold the line with this 50-percent educational system that I mentioned, but to go on and develop the kind of educational system that this world crisis calls for once again calls for an act of great vision on the part of the Federal Government, one that is equal to that of our forefathers in the late 1700's, equal to that of the statesmen of 1862 when Lincoln signed the Morrill Act and the others that I have mentioned.

If the Federal Government would pass one bit of sound legislation equivalent in its general pattern and structure to those pieces of legislation, we would indefinitely improve

education in this country at a reduced total cost.

Dr. NORTON. . . . If it was a shortage of available manpower, a lack of human resources that was in the way, it would be really serious, but we have just thousands of capable young people that we know can take the training; and many of them are quite anxious to take the training, but their families are poor or they have younger children that they have to help through college.

There are all kinds of financial obstacles that stand in the way of their getting that training, including those who for one reason or another never get through high school. There are areas in this country where high schools are too far away, some of our slum areas need education. That being the situation, there is every reason why we should make every effort to capitalize all of our human resources, far more than any other time in our history.

Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CORDON obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, would it be convenient to the Senator from Oregon to yield to me at this time for about 7 or 8 minutes? If not, I will not request him to yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I would like to go forward with the measure pending before the Senate, if the Senator can wait; otherwise, I will yield to him.

Mr. McCARRAN. If preferable to the Senator, I shall wait.

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. President, I first want to add my words of congratulation and appreciation to the words addressed by other Senators to the Senator from Alabama, for his most eloquent plea for further educational advantages for the youth of America. I sincerely appreciate the evangelism which he has shown in this cause, and which has extended over a number of years. I regret that I must rise at this time in opposition to his amendment to Senate bill 1901, though I say I am not rising in opposition to any sound system of aid for education, State or Federal.

HILL PROPOSAL NOT EFFECTIVE

I agree with the Senator from Alabama that one of the greatest forward steps ever taken by any nation was that taken by the United States when certain sections of the public lands were earmarked, as it were, and granted to the newly admitted States for the benefit of education. I certainly cannot stand here and validly criticize the dedication of net receipts from the outer Continental Shelf for the benefit of education, and I do not want to be understood as doing that. I doubt, however, the wisdom of the approach which is here

made. I do doubt that this approach can be at all effective in achieving the result which has been so eloquently set forth as the target by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I have heretofore voted against Federal aid for education. I voted against it because I was fearful that involved in any such legislation was a possibility that the Federal Government, by virtue of holding the purse-strings for educational purposes, might influence and control the educational processes. That has been the danger which free peoples have faced through the centuries. I have always believed in a free public school. I believe in it now. I believe the public school system should be wholly under the control of the States and not under the control of the Federal Government.

STATE CONTROL OF FUNDS

However, Mr. President, if the net receipts from these lands were dedicated to public schools and the sole obligation of the Federal Government was that of an administrator receiving the money and allocating and prorating it to the States to be then expended under the direction of the States, the objection I have heretofore advanced would not be pertinent.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is it not true that the amendment which I offered accomplishes that by making the Federal Government the administrator?

Mr. CORDON. That is unquestionably a fact. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, and which was considered by the Senate Interior Committee, does not carry any strings which might be pulled by an overzealous Federal Government in anywise to influence education. The point which bothers me is, to speak quite frankly, that I cannot understand how the amendment of the Senator from Alabama could have been offered again and again and again and still have within it such fatal deficiencies to achieve the purpose which it is sought to achieve, as we have heard the idea advanced by the Senator from Alabama. That is what bothers me, Mr. President. That is why I am on my feet at this time.

NO CERTAINTY IN PROPOSAL

I invite attention, Mr. President, to the fact that so far as the Hill amendment is concerned, if it were adopted and if this bill were passed and signed, there would be no certainty that any student in the elementary schools, in the high schools, or in the colleges would ever get a nickel of money from this source. That bothers me, Mr. President.

I hope the Senator from Alabama, when I finish, or, at least, before the debate is concluded, will advise the Senate as to his thinking in presenting an amendment with the fatal deficiencies which are now included in it.

For the benefit of Members of the Senate now on the floor, let me read the amendment. It is short.

On page 25, line 25, it is proposed to strike out the words "credited to miscellaneous receipts" and to insert in lieu

thereof the following—and this is the amendment: "held in a special account and, except for the payment of refunds under the provisions of section 10 of this act, such moneys shall be appropriated exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education: *Provided, however,* That during the present national emergency, but not for more than 3 years, the moneys in such special account may be appropriated for such urgent developments essential to the national defense as the Congress may determine."

The remainder of the amendment is of no consequence. It is perfecting only.

Mr. President, the amendment provides, in substance, that all receipts from the outer Continental Shelf shall be applied, first, to pay back any moneys which may have been overpaid or paid twice by those who are conducting oil operations on the Shelf, and that thereafter, after 3 years, all funds received may be used for national defense purposes. At the end of 3 years or sooner, should the emergency cease, the funds shall be "appropriated exclusively as grants in aid of primary, secondary, and higher education."

NO STANDARDS FOR DISTRIBUTION

That is the meat of the amendment. Appropriated, Mr. President, by whom? Appropriated, Mr. President, to whom? Appropriated, Mr. President, in what amount, in what percentages? Appropriated to primary education as distinguished from secondary education, or secondary education as distinguished from higher education, or higher education as distinguished from either of the other two? What yardstick is to measure the appropriation as between the classes of education, as between the beneficiaries, whether they be State, county, or school districts?

Where in the amendment are there any standards, any directions, any provisions of any kind or character by which 1 red cent could ever get out of the Federal Treasury and go to the benefit of anyone for any kind of education? I cannot find it. It is not there.

Mr. President, I can only assume that those who have studied this matter, who have been responsible for offering this amendment, are fully aware of the fact that heretofore, time after time, the Congress has endeavored to do something in the way of granting, from the Federal Treasury, aid to education. Never since the passage of the Land Grant Act—and that was not a grant of money, but a grant of land to the several States without strings, except that the money was for the use of the common schools—never since that time has there been any grant directly from the Federal Treasury to the aid of the common schools.

Since I have been a Member of the Senate, on at least two occasions the question has come before the Senate. Bills, I believe, in both instances were passed by the Senate, but died in the House. In each instance there was interminable debate revolving around two major questions:

First. How should the money be allocated as between States?

Second. How should the money be expended on the part of the beneficiary

States? Should it be held solely for public schools, or should it be divided in some way between public and private schools? On those two rocks, the ship of Federal aid to education has been wrecked every time.

PROPOSAL MAY BE SPRINGBOARD

Mr. President, it may be that those who have presented this amendment, having in mind the record of failure in this field, have felt that if they could take one little toddling step first, that is, if they could sequester funds, such a step might be a springboard from which they could go on the rest of the way. If so, I have never heard the matter presented on the floor of the Senate. I have heard of some references to the perplexities and complexities of the situation, but no one ever has brought the skeleton out into the open and rattled its bones. I think the time has come to do just that.

During the debate on the submerged lands bill, Senate Joint Resolution 13, the same proposal was discussed at length. There is nothing in those debates to indicate that the adoption of an amendment such as the one now pending would mean or could mean the use of any money in aid of any education until Congress had taken further action and had provided yardsticks and an administrative body to handle that distribution. I believe the RECORD ought to be clear with reference to the amendment. I have spoken to the author of the amendment about the matter. I have urged that the bill contain standards and that it be at least self-executing if enacted. I again urge that that approach be taken.

So far as we are concerned today, the adoption of the Hill amendment and the enactment thereafter of the bill would, in legal contemplation, mean only that: such funds as were available for a maximum period of 3 years might be used for the running expenses of the Government in the field of national defense. Thereafter, for time unending, all the receipts would be sequestered in the Federal Treasury and would be absolutely useless for any purpose until Congress provided by additional law for their disposition.

The Senate has before it two amendments on the subject covered by the Hill amendment. The other amendment has been offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON]. That amendment, at least, has the virtue of providing a yardstick for allocation and providing authority for distribution. We may differ with respect to the yardstick for allocation.

In the Hendrickson amendment it is provided that the money shall be divided on a pro rata basis among the States according to the percentage of school children in each State as compared with all the school children of the United States. It would be a per capita school-child distribution.

PRO RATA BASIS OF DISTRIBUTION

That is one method of distribution that heretofore has been debated on the floor, one as to which serious objection has been raised, because the other group have felt that the division should be not on a pro rata basis, but upon some basis

of financial need in the areas. Pro rata distribution would be possible at any time, predicated on the most recent census. Any distribution on the basis of need can be had only after the need has been ascertained in some way, and such ascertainment can be had only when there are agents of the Government who are empowered to make it and to act upon it. Nothing of that character is found in the Hill amendment.

I hope that if it be the view of the Senate that the net receipts from the outer Continental Shelf should be dedicated to education, we may have presented a proposal which, if enacted, would accomplish the desired purpose. Let us not simply make a gesture in favor of education.

NO PROVISION FOR ADMINISTRATION

Marvelous as was the speech of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], sincere as he unquestionably is in his support of education, his speech cannot be cashed in dollars from receipts of income derived from the outer Continental Shelf. Legislation would be required to do that. It would take a mandate to do it. It would take machinery of Government to do it. None of those requirements are provided in the Hill amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Oregon is correct in his statement. What the amendment does is to dedicate the revenues from the outer Continental Shelf to a purpose, to a cause—to the specific cause of education. Once such a dedication is made in this bill, Congress can then consider the question raised by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Why should it not be raised and considered now?

Mr. HILL. It should not be considered now for the reason that the proper committee to deal with educational legislation should study the matter. That committee should hold hearings, should weigh proposed legislation, and then bring in a bill. The Senator knows that his committee, fine and as splendid as it may be, is a committee that deals with an entirely different subject than the matter of education.

The Senator from Oregon knows full well that there was neither the opportunity nor, I may say, the disposition on the part of his committee to go into a long hearing, such as should be had, to determine the methods of allocation, standards, and such other questions connected with the distribution of funds. But once Congress dedicates the funds, we may be sure that Congress will come forward with the next step, which will be to provide the mechanics for the distribution of the funds.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished Senator from Oregon has made a splendid speech on the questions raised in the amendment, and in his remarks I fully concur.

Is it not true that, in addition to what the Senator has said up to this point,

such an amendment as is proposed, whether the Hill amendment or the Hendrickson amendment, would be merely a gesture, and would not mean the granting of any Federal funds to education until Congress enacted a full scale Federal aid to education bill? On the other hand, is it not true that the greatest relief that could be given to school children would be by balancing the budget, reducing Federal expenditures, curbing inflation, and then reducing Federal taxation, in order that the parents of school children, who have the primary responsibility for local and State taxation for school programs, may have something left in their pockets to do the job for which they are primarily responsible?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Virginia presents a cogent and sound argument. Of course, in the last analysis the only possible value that can accrue from action of this kind is in the field of evangelism. The Senator from Alabama is well equipped in that field. There is only sincerity in my mind and heart when I say that. He is not only well equipped, but he has done an outstanding job in arousing throughout the United States a very great enthusiasm for early and adequate Federal aid to education.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

To the extent that this amendment has been the vehicle upon which that crusade might travel, it has been valuable. From the standpoint of representing any answer to the crusade, it is not valuable.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is familiar with the fact that the junior Senator from Louisiana has an amendment to require the Secretary of the Treasury to report to the Congress the amount of money which is being realized from the Continental Shelf, is he not?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator from Oregon also knows that thus far the only production on the Continental Shelf of any revenue consists entirely of production off the State of Louisiana. Is the Senator familiar with that fact?

Mr. CORDON. That is the testimony before the committee.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that the revenues therefrom would be only \$1, \$2, or perhaps \$3 million a year, based upon the present rate of production in that area?

Mr. CORDON. The amount is not large. I assume that that figure is approximately correct.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator familiar with the further fact that the lowest estimate we have had as to what we ought to provide for Federal aid to education—not in all branches, but Federal aid to primary education—when the Senate passed the Federal aid to education bill, that it would require at least \$100 million to make any appreciable start on Federal aid to education?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon does not recall the figure, but it was a figure of considerable size.

Mr. LONG. It is my recollection that the Bureau of the Budget at the time when the administration of President Truman asked us to undertake the program, estimated that it would require about \$200 million as a first installment on Federal aid to education for 1 year. Does the Senator recall a figure of that nature—perhaps around \$200 million?

Mr. CORDON. It seems to me that that was solely in the construction field, without going into the operating field.

Mr. LONG. The point the junior Senator from Louisiana has in mind is that this amendment, which seeks to commit the Congress to a program of Federal aid to education, proposes to relate it to a source of revenue which will be very small for a long period of time, when we consider the enormous amount of money which the program would require. Therefore, this amendment would commit the Congress to a course of action in aiding education in all the States which would be far more expensive than any return we could hope to realize in the next several years from the production of oil and gas on the Continental Shelf. So it would actually commit us to a spending program far greater than any revenues we could hope to realize from the outer Continental Shelf in the immediate future.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. CORDON. I yield first to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon apparently agrees with the thesis of the Senator from Louisiana. There is no assurance of any particular amount, and no mention of any particular amount. The amendment reads in part as follows:

Provided, however, That during the present national emergency, but not for more than 3 years, the moneys in such special account may be appropriated for such urgent developments essential to the national defense as the Congress may determine.

Does the Senator from Oregon see anything in that language that makes any representations or gives any assurance as to a specific amount to be used?

Mr. CORDON. There is nothing, of course, that gives any idea with respect to a specific amount, or holds out any representation as to a specific amount being probable. Neither did the Senator from Louisiana suggest that there was. As I understood the Senator from Louisiana, he was simply calling attention to what he felt were the probabilities of the future with respect to funds accruing from that source. He predicated his remarks upon a comparison between the estimated need for Federal aid to education and the probable answer which could be found from funds accruing from the Continental Shelf.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is there anything in the Hill amendment which in the slightest degree mentions a specific amount, or seeks to commit the Federal Gov-

ernment to the use or setting aside of any specific amount? Of course we all realize that the amount of revenues which will come from these rich oil lands is problematical; but certainly there is nothing new in the history of government in earmarking certain contingent revenues for specific purposes. Every State and every municipality has been doing that for as long a time as I can remember.

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New York. Of course, there is nothing in the amendment which suggests any specific amount, or which suggests any use for the amount which could be made available under the terms of the amendment. That is its weakness.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that when the first Holland bill was before us the statement was made on the floor of the Senate that we were proposing to give away from \$50 billion to \$300 billion?

Mr. CORDON. It seems to me that I recall something to that effect.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Some educators were led to believe that there was a perfect bonanza there if we would only pass the Hill amendment and earmark the funds for public education.

In line with the questions asked by the junior Senator from Louisiana as to the prospective costs to the Federal Government if we should take an initial step which might lead the States to believe that eventually they could unload on the Federal Government both construction costs and maintenance and operating costs, the junior Senator from Virginia made an inquiry about 4 years ago of the office of Education, as to the total construction costs if every State were to get every new schoolhouse it indicated it would like to have. The answer was \$10 billion.

The junior Senator from Virginia recalls, as possibly the senior Senator from Oregon may recall, that on a previous occasion, when there was before the Senate a straight bill for Federal Aid to Education, which at that time was vigorously opposed by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who subsequently changed his position on the issue, the Senator from Ohio predicted that if we started with such a program it would eventually mean an annual cost to the Federal Government of \$3 billion. Does the Senator recall those facts?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon does not recall them clearly, but evidently the Senator from Virginia does.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The last Federal aid to education bill considered by the Senate was passed by an overwhelming majority. I think the distinguished Senator from Virginia was one of 19 Senators who voted against that bill. The vote, as I recall, was 59 to 19, the Senator from Virginia being one of the 19 Senators who voted against the bill. It was the

Taft bill which we passed, a bill introduced and championed by the great Senator from Ohio.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As the Senator from Arizona once told me, if one is on both sides of a question he cannot be more than 50 percent wrong. [Laughter.]

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I cannot follow two speakers at the same time.

Mr. HILL. Let me say this in connection with being on both sides of a question: A very wise man, Abraham Lincoln, once said it was a mighty dumb man who did not have more sense today than he had yesterday. I hope that tomorrow the Senator from Virginia will leave the 19 Senators with whom he stood against the Taft bill, and join those of us who feel as did the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] when he introduced his bill, in supporting Federal aid to education.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia would vote today as he has always voted. He considers this proposal to be unsound, and he does not want any part of it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I did not express that hope for the Senator from Virginia for today. I said on tomorrow I hoped he would be a wiser man.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. CORDON. Inasmuch as it seems I am unable to have my friends direct questions to the bill, I decline to yield at all.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for one more question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Alabama for a question.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, did not the testimony before the committee show that about 80 percent of the oil and gas resources are on the outer Continental Shelf?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. They are the resources we are now dealing with in the pending bill?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Of course the estimates, ranging from \$40 billion to \$50 billion, up to \$270 billion and \$300 billion, not only contemplated the oil on the outer Continental Shelf, but also the oil in the areas covered by the Holland bill.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

Mr. CORDON. The estimates referred to included the proceeds from the so-called give-away that was so eloquently paraded before the American people. These estimates include the income from five-sixths of the resources which are still to be sequestered and placed in the Treasury of the United States, so far as the United States can get the royalties, rentals, and bonuses.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I first yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, is the figure which both the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Oregon

have just quoted accurate, namely, that approximately 80 percent of the known oil reserves are in the area which is now being dealt with, not within the territorial or historic boundaries of the several coastal States?

Mr. CORDON. It is only an estimate. The Senator from Oregon knows that it could not be anything except a speculative estimate. It was estimated that five-sixths of the reserves in the lands lying seaward from inland waters out to the edge of the Shelf were outside the State boundaries, in what is here described as the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CORDON. I yield further to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the so-called exaggerated statements that were made are not exaggerated statements, and if \$300 million worth of oil is involved, then only one-sixth of it was involved in the so-called Holland bill, and we are now dealing with five-sixths, or with three hundred or four hundred billion dollars. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. The amount would be one-sixth as against five-sixths. Of course, this statement must be made about it, namely, that the one-sixth represents more nearly proven oil and oil that can be obtained at much less cost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Without wishing to ruffle the doves, nevertheless, is it not true that if a man kidnaps 6 children and returns 5 of them, but keeps 1 in his custody, he is still a kidnaper?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, at one time or another the Senator from Oregon would expect to be asked that kind of question. The Senator from Oregon will answer any question that is even remotely pertinent to the issue, but he will leave the subject of kidnapping until the Senate takes up the criminal field.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If a kidnaper has kidnaped 5 children and he tries to kidnap another one, he is still a kidnaper; is he not?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is not going to go into that kidnapping case either.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Louisiana would like to ask if there is not some peril to the Senators who are offering the pending amendment. They stood on the floor of the Senate for 6 weeks and stated that \$300 billion was involved. If their amendment should be adopted, and the public should find that there are available revenues of only about \$2 million a year, which is less than one-thousandth of the money which they represented was involved, some embarrassment might come to them in trying to explain to the people of America where the billions of dollars went. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. I have found that explanations can be made, but that the facts sometimes do not have too much to do with the explanations.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. CORDON. I yield further to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. On the other hand, if there were actually \$300 billion worth of revenue to be realized, as the public was led to believe there might be, and five-sixths of it is outside the historic boundaries of the States, that would be just about the amount needed to pay off the national debt. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. Of course, anyone who has paid attention to the facts recognizes that, at least under existing techniques and leasing provisions and practices, 12½ percent is the most that would come to the Treasury of the United States, plus a few scattering dollars from rentals, and the like; and that amount, of course, would have to be offset against administrative costs, and the like.

However, when one gets into flights of oratory, when one engages in an educational seminar on the floor of the Senate, and when the Ivy League is in full swing, facts cease to be of moment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield for a question—a pertinent question, the Senator from Oregon hopes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. Is it not correct to say that it was Dr. Pratt, the former vice president of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, who estimated that the oil reserves offshore from the coasts of the United States amounted to probably 100 billion barrels?

Mr. CORDON. The answer is yes. It was on that basis that the \$300 billion figure was reached. There was no background for it except a speculative estimate. The only study that was made was the study conducted by the United States Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior. However, the Senator from Oregon understands the extravagance that comes from eloquence improperly controlled.

Getting back to the case at hand, which is the amendment now before the Senate, the Senator from Alabama has suggested a proposal providing the administrative machinery could not be made complete until it had consideration by the appropriate committee of the Senate, with long hearings, and so forth.

LARGE AMOUNT OF INFORMATION AVAILABLE

There is logic in the contention. The Senator from Oregon recognizes that fact. The Senator from Oregon, however, feels that the subject has been before Congress a long time, and that all hearings necessary to properly implement this sort of amendment could have been had upon a bill comprehending the provisions of this amendment, or in a bill providing for aid to education.

As a matter of fact, there are few subjects of great interest to the United States on which there is more available data immediately at hand than in the field of education.

We have agencies of the Federal Government and of the States which have been concerned with the subject for many years. All of the information necessary could have been made available. The matter could have been presented in such a way that the Senate could have acted, and the House could have acted, upon an amendment which would have done the job this amendment is held out as doing, but does not do. That is the complaint of the Senator from Oregon with respect to the Hill amendment.

Again I call attention to the fact that the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey at least can be said to have the merit of being workable, if it is adopted and enacted into law. At least it provides that, at a definite time, a specific agent of the Government shall pay specific funds in specific percentages to the beneficiary States, to be used for educational purposes in the United States. In that way there would be a chance for some aid to be given to education if the bill including that amendment could be passed.

PROPOSAL WILL RESULT IN DELAY

However, in my humble opinion the bill will not be passed with that amendment in it. Again we shall encounter the same situation we have had to fight time after time after time; and when we do, the result will be to tie up this measure in the way that other measures have been tied up. In the end we shall have to deal with the problem at hand, which is the implementation of the recovery of minerals from the outer Continental Shelf—period. That is all we should do here.

If the Senator from Alabama will work out a sound legislative proposal that is complete in itself and that will do the job that he has suggested, and will do it in such a way that the money that accrues from the outer Continental Shelf will be divided among the States of the United States, with the Government of the United States retaining no right to require, in any way at all, what is to be done with the funds in the field of education, but permitting those decisions to be made by the States, who thus will be able to use in their own way the funds for education, I shall be glad to support that proposal, despite the fact that we now have a national debt of more than \$260 billion.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia who said that in the last analysis, the only way we shall be able to take care of that debt, and thus save the economy of the United States, is to have an ever-broadening economy. I agree, and I will go forward with such a proposal, and I will join in that kind of a measure.

But, Mr. President, I will not support a measure which I know amounts only to a gesture.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I interpret the amendment, it simply provides that the money be placed in a pool and be held there until Congress takes future action. Is not that all the amendment would do?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Before the schools or education or anything else would ever

receive any benefit from any of these revenues, there would have to be further legislation. Is not that correct?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the amendment dedicates these funds to education? Congress would subsequently provide the machinery and mechanics for the allocation and distribution of the funds; but the amendment does dedicate these funds to education, does it not?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct, in that the funds could only be appropriated exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; but to what agency, in what amount when, by whom, and for what purpose the amendment is silent. Not only is there no certainty that there ever would be implementation, but we have a record against it.

Mr. President, let us consider aid-for-education proposals on which we can vote, so that the House can either accept or reject them. Then, and then only, will such funds be available for education.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Senator from Oregon said something extremely important when he urged that we reach a vote on this measure and that we proceed.

Mr. CORDON. I certainly believe that is what we should do.

Mr. ANDERSON. As the Senator from Oregon knows, I have some amendments about which I could talk, and I could talk for several hours about the bill itself. The Senator from Oregon knows my long interest in this subject. However, is it not a fact that the most important job for us to do is to reach a vote on these issues as quickly as we can?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am so fully in agreement that I now yield the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Mexico, and in view of my own disposition, I shall speak only very briefly.

I believe everyone knows my position on this question. I spoke for many hours on the submerged-lands resolution and the Hill amendment when they were before the Senate a month or so ago. So I shall speak very briefly today regarding the Hill amendment, of which I am very proud to be a cosponsor.

Of course it is trite to state that our young people are our greatest asset and that their education is of the highest importance. I think the statement made by the great senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] summed up the situation about as well as it could be summed up, when he stated on the floor of the Senate, an hour or so ago, that at a time of diminishing natural resources in the United States—and unfortunately they are diminishing—we must utilize to the greatest possible extent the skills of our people. I may be paraphrasing the

statement made by the Senator from Georgia, but I believe I state the gist of his remarks. Certainly what he said is true.

I have heard it said that many persons who have had little or no education have risen to great heights. An example of that was my good friend, the late Al Smith, of New York, one of my predecessors in the governorship of New York. Another example is Henry Ford. Of course there are scores of others. However, these men were exceptions. Generally speaking, in the case of the vast majority of the people there is no substitute for a sound education. I believe that is fully realized by everyone. Yet, despite the great gains we have made in the field of education, we still lag far behind what we should be doing.

I believe that is best illustrated by the fact that in the examinations held under the Selective Service System, in connection with the recent wars in which we have been engaged, a very substantial percentage of our young men who appeared for examination were found deficient in education or were found mentally deficient because of a lack of education. Certainly there was no justification for that situation, in a country so resourceful, so wealthy, and so powerful as the United States of America.

Mr. President, our failure to provide adequately for education affects every branch of education. It affects the elementary schools, the high schools, the colleges and universities, and the graduate schools. Today we need, more than we ever have needed in the entire history of our country, well-educated men and women in every walk of life, regardless of whether they live in urban areas or in rural areas. In this connection, the place of their residence makes no difference. The problems and difficulties and opportunities are much the same.

I wish to have the opportunities for education equalized among all the 160 million people of the United States. Education is needed in business, on the farms, in the professions—in medicine, nursing, dentistry, engineering, and the sciences.

We are particularly in need of better education for teachers—the men and women who instruct our young people in various educational lines, and help them to become sound and responsible citizens of our country.

There is no question at all in the mind of anyone who listened to the debate some weeks ago that the teachers of America are tragically underpaid. I believe the salaries paid to teachers in New York State are probably the highest of any teachers' salaries paid in the entire Union; but even in New York State the salaries paid the teaching staff are completely inadequate, when we realize that those men and women, in order to prepare themselves for the teaching profession, have to spend many years in studying to become adequate preceptors of the youth of our land. There is little encouragement for well qualified men and women to engage in the teaching profession. If that is true in New York, it is certainly true also that teachers' salaries are completely inadequate, tragically inadequate, in many other

States of the Union which, through no fault of their own, are less well situated in a material way than my own State of New York.

Mr. President, as I have said, in New York, inadequate as their compensation is, higher salaries are paid to teachers than in any other State in the Union. In many instances the salaries of teachers are less than those paid to garbage collectors, vermin exterminators, wash-room attendants, and unskilled household workers. Certainly we cannot hope to enlist the interest and the support and the wholehearted skillful efforts of men and women on the basis of such inadequate pay.

Education is of equal interest to all the States of the Union. What difference does it make whether a boy or girl lives in Georgia, in Mississippi, in Arizona, in South Dakota, in Alabama, or in New York? They are all American citizens, they are all part of our great Nation, and in many cases they claim relationship to many States. My own family, after having lived in Louisiana, went to Alabama, and from there to New York, where it remained. There are today hundreds of thousands of citizens and residents of New York who have come from all the States of the Union, and they are good, loyal, productive citizens. On the other hand, many residents of New York go to Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, California, Washington, Oregon, Arizona, and other States, to build their lives there.

What difference does it make in which State a boy or girl is born? It is to the interest of New York, it is to the interest of Mississippi, and Florida, and Arizona, to have well-educated citizens. It is to the interest of those States to have well-educated and well-trained boys and girls who may become teachers in the States of the Northeast, the Southeast, the Northwest, and the Southwest.

Mr. President, in my opinion the pending amendment is a sound one. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who, I regret, is no longer on the floor, raised the question of what return there would be from oil revenues. I do not know what the return would be. We have estimated the value of the oil in the ground underlying the submerged lands at between \$50 billion and \$300 billion, royalties of 12½ percent on which would accrue to the States, in the case of lands within the historic boundaries of the States, and to the Federal Government, on the outer shelf. If the return were only \$50 billion, the royalties which could be used for education would amount to more than \$6 billion. Let us say the return is \$100 billion: the royalties of 12½ percent would amount to \$12.5 billion. If the return were only \$1 billion, the royalties would amount, nonetheless to \$120 million; and, of course, I do not believe the return would be that small; I believe it would be 100 or 200 times that.

There is nothing in the amendment, as implied by some of the speakers who have preceded me, which would involve the Federal Government's taking over the responsibility of education. There is not a word, not an implication, not

a suggestion to that effect. All we are proposing is to set aside and earmark for the purpose of education the funds to be derived from oil and gas produced on the Continental Shelf which will come into the Treasury of the United States, and to give such funds to all the States of the Union, under rules and regulation and provisions to be determined by the Congress of the United States. There is no suggestion or intimation that the Federal Government will assume the responsibility for education in the States. The funds, when they flow into the Treasury, will be used to supplement the educational funds of the States, and certainly money will flow into the Treasury in large amounts, though the amounts may be less than have been predicted.

So, Mr. President, I strongly urge that the amendment of the Senator from Alabama and his associates be agreed to. It will be of tremendous assistance to many of the States; but, what is much more important, it will be of very great benefit to the entire Nation, to every citizen of the United States who has a boy or a girl, as well as to every citizen who is interested in the welfare and advancement of the interests of the country. I appeal to my fellow Senators to vote for the Hill amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and other Senators, to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gore	McCarran
Anderson	Green	McCarthy
Barrett	Griswold	McClellan
Beall	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hennings	Monroney
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bush	Hill	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Hunt	Payne
Capehart	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cooper	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kerr	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kilgore	Stennis
Douglas	Knowland	Symington
Duff	Kuchel	Taft
Dworshak	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Lehman	Watkins
Ferguson	Long	Welker
Flanders	Magnuson	Wiley
Frear	Malone	Williams
George	Mansfield	Young
Gillette	Martin	
Goldwater	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for himself and other Senators, to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MALONE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is necessarily absent. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MAYBANK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PORTER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] are absent on official committee business. If present and voting the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PORTER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP]. If present and voting the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] would vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea."

I further announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—45

Alken	Hennings	McClellan
Anderson	Hill	Monroney
Case	Hunt	Mundt
Chavez	Jackson	Murray
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Duff	Kefauver	Smathers
Dworshak	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Frear	Kerr	Sparkman
George	Kilgore	Stennis
Gillette	Langer	Symington
Gore	Lehman	Welker
Green	Magnuson	Wiley
Hayden	Mansfield	Young

NAYS—37

Barrett	Butler, Md.	Cordon
Beall	Butler, Nebr.	Daniel
Bennett	Byrd	Dirksen
Bricker	Capehart	Ellender
Bush	Carlson	Ferguson

Flanders	Kuchel
Goldwater	Martin
Griswold	McCarran
Hickenlooper	McCarthy
Hoey	Millikin
Holland	Payne
Jenner	Purtell
Knowland	Robertson

Saltonstall
Smith, N. J.
Taft
Thye
Watkins
Williams

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	Ives	Potter
Eastland	Long	Schoeppel
Fulbright	Malone	Smith, N. C.
Hendrickson	Maybank	Tobey
Humphrey	Morse	

So the amendment offered by Mr. HILL, for himself and other Senators to Mr. DANIEL's amendment, was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which my amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, what is the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] to reconsider the vote by which the Hill amendment to the Daniel amendment was agreed to. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. DOUGLAS' motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at an appropriate place in the debate on the outer Continental Shelf bill, a statement by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], relating to the oil-for-education amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON OIL FOR EDUCATION

Mr. President, I want to address myself in support of the Hill oil-for-education amendment, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor. Not so long ago I worked hard for the adoption of this amendment, together with the Anderson bill, as an alternative to the submerged lands act. Now, I urge adoption of the amendment in connection with S. 1901. I urge that the far-sighted principle of providing for the education of American citizens out of the revenues from the rich Federal oil reserves in the Continental Shelf be attached to the bill which provides for the development of those mineral reserves.

What is the oil-for-education amendment? It simply provides that the royalties from oil in the Continental Shelf be set aside in an independent fund. The moneys in this fund shall be used for purposes of national defense during the present emergency. As soon as Congress decides, then they shall be apportioned among the States to help meet the growing costs of education.

There is nothing of political or Federal intervention in education involved in this proposal. The money will be distributed on an established ratio among the States. The fund which will be established will be independent of politics and the money will be dedicated by law to national defense and to education. There can be no political meddling with it. Neither can there be any question of the Federal Government tying strings to the money or interfering in any way in the educational standards or philosophies of the States. The States are to

use the money as they wish, so long as it is used for education.

Now, Mr. President, I want to devote the balance of my comments to the crying financial needs of education in our country today, to the importance to our national progress and security of an adequate educational system, and to the historical precedents for such measures as the pending Hill amendment.

The oil-for-education amendment is the answer to a desperate need on the part of American education. Testifying before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for this amendment, Mr. Benjamin Fine, the educational expert of the New York Times, had this to say about the present critical financial situation in education:

"Crisis is an overworked term. When it is used often enough it loses its impact. We just shrug our shoulders and accept it. The impact is no longer there. Yet we must be realistic. We cannot, ostrichlike, bury our heads in the sand and do nothing.

"Is there a crisis in education? I could spend hours giving a firsthand picture—conditions that I saw with my own eyes as I have visited schools in the North, South, East, or West—that would convince you, if further evidence is needed, that our schools and colleges need help.

"Said President Truman: 'Our public-school system faces the greatest crisis in its history.'

"Said the American Federation of Teachers: 'The Nation's schools face their most severe crisis in our country's history.'

"Said the American Federation of Labor: 'A financial crisis exists in the schools and colleges of this country.'

"Said United States Commissioner of Education Dr. Earl J. McGrath: 'The tidal wave of children bearing down on our schools bids fair to overwhelm us.'

"I could go on and on, citing testimonials. But I won't. I don't think they are really necessary. I think that anyone who has visited our public schools and our colleges in many sections of the country have seen at firsthand—as I have—that the educational system is sick."

There is a large number of immediate and pressing problems in American education today. One of these is the shortage of qualified elementary and high school teachers. It is estimated by the New York Times that this country will need at least 105,000 new elementary school teachers annually over the next 10 years to meet the present and future increases in enrollment. Yet, teachers' colleges are now supplying only 35,000 teachers annually. The shortage of high school teachers is not so acute, yet we need 48,000 more high school teachers annually to replace those who leave teaching. By 1960 we shall need 70,000 new high school teachers.

Dr. Earl McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, has warned:

"The blunt fact is, unless we do something drastic, and immediately, to relieve the teacher shortage, a whole generation of American boys and girls will be shortchanged in their right to obtain a fundamental education.

"The thinner you stretch your available teaching staff to cover the unprecedented and inexorably increasing enrollments in our public schools, the less chance there is for a teacher to do a competent job of teaching. It is the child who inevitably suffers. And when the child suffers, the Nation suffers."

Part of the demand for new teachers comes from present and anticipated increases in school enrollment. Elementary school enrollment today is increasing by 1,000,000 children a year. Elementary and high schools together this year enrolled 1,700,000 more children than they did in the last school year. Clearly, if teaching is to be adequate, the teaching force will have to be increased.

Yet, there are other reasons why school teachers are in short supply. Dedicated as many of our school teachers are to their work, they often find that they simply cannot make ends meet financially on the salaries which teachers are paid at present. Men and women with families often have to drop out of teaching and take up other professions. Many school teachers have to eke out their small incomes by working part time at other jobs. Often, this work impairs their teaching. Certainly it must tend to impair their enthusiasm for teaching; and this enthusiasm is vital to the teaching function.

A recent survey by the New York Times found many public school teachers' salaries to be utterly inadequate. Six States, the IMTES discovered, pay teachers less than \$20 a week, on an average. Ten others pay a minimum of from \$20 to \$25 a week. The average American school teacher earns about \$60 a week.

It is certainly no wonder that the teacher shortage is acute. It is no wonder that people leave teaching for better-paying jobs, in defense work and the other professions. It is no wonder that many teachers, in many States, are poorly qualified to teach—that the total number of fully qualified teachers needed right away comes to 87,000. Neither is it any wonder—though it is a terribly alarming fact, that our best students no longer plan to become teachers, and do not enter teaching colleges or take training for teaching.

A report of the Educational Testing Service, the organization which conducts the College Board Examinations throughout the country, recently demonstrated that men who are preparing for the teaching profession have the lowest grades and are the poorest students of all our college and university students.

Of the 600,000 elementary schoolteachers in the United States today—according to the National Education Association—300,000 do not hold college degrees. To quote the New York Times further, "Of this number, the National Education Association says, at least 100,000 are so inadequately prepared as to make their continued presence in the classroom dangerous to the mental and emotional growth of America's youth."

Now low pay is only one reason for this drastic teacher shortage. Poor training facilities, poor working conditions, as well as a lack of public respect for the teaching profession, are other reasons why we do not have the schoolteachers we so desperately need. No doubt, lack of public respect for the teaching profession is based partly on the fact that our teachers are a low-income group. And partly, perhaps, on the fact that in some States they are not really prepared for their jobs.

Higher salaries will meet part of the problem. But they will not meet all of it. We will have to improve working conditions. And we will have to do this, not only for the sake of our teachers, but primarily for the sake of our students.

School building programs in the United States are terribly behind the need for new facilities. One out of five schools in the United States is now obsolete. Many children go to school in two or more shifts a day, under conditions more like factories than schools. Many children attend school in buildings which are not school buildings at all. Simply as an indication of this dire condition, let me read once again from the New York Times report of its survey of American education.

"Our understaffed, badly housed schools faced an unprecedented period of shortage. It is doubtful that even half of the 80,000 classrooms needed in 1952 will be constructed. School systems everywhere are sending out SOS signals. They are utilizing every conceivable space to keep school open. It is not unusual to find children attending school in private homes, church basements,

store lofts or in one case observed by this writer, a section of an undertaker's parlor. Supplies, equipment, and textbooks are lacking in many schools.

"State after State reports impaired educational facilities because of inadequate buildings. In Illinois, for example, the lack of steel and other critical materials is preventing the construction of a number of school buildings. Approximately 13,000 students in Illinois are enrolled in schools where double sessions are necessary, while 7,500 are attending schools in buildings that are definitely inadequate.

"Pennsylvania likewise reports a serious building shortage, even though \$35 million was spent for new buildings during the 1950-51 school year, and \$50 million will be spent during 1951-52. In this State it is estimated that 8,500 pupils will suffer an impairment in school this year because of double sessions or part-time instruction."

Dr. McGrath, the United States Commissioner of Education, has said:

"Additional floor space equal to a one-story building, 52 feet wide extending from New York City to San Francisco, Calif., is needed adequately to house the Nation's public elementary and secondary school population."

My own State of Minnesota needs a total amount of \$165,959,000 to meet its needs for school construction. Yet Minnesota, like most other States, is short of funds. We do not feel that we can tax people much more. Localities are at their limits for bond issues for education. The situation is truly desperate.

The estimated cost of building the necessary schools to meet the Nation's needs is \$10.7 billion. Under present State and local laws and conditions it will only be possible to raise \$5.8 billion, if every resource is tapped. That leaves a deficit of nearly \$5 billion. The oil-for-education amendment is made to order for this emergency, as well as for the emergency shortages in teachers, and the low standards of teachers' training and teachers' salaries.

Nor is higher education in this country facing a less serious financial problem. The New York Times reports that 1 out of every 3 liberal arts colleges in this country is currently operating in the red. Many other colleges are beginning to lower their standards so as to meet financial pressures and stay in the black.

The usual college incomes from grants, bequests, and endowments have fallen off sharply. Colleges have suffered from the rapid fluctuations in enrollment during the war, postwar, and present periods. Since most men have now used up their GI money, college enrollments have once again fallen off sharply.

These problems are increased by inflation, which, as the Commission on Financing Higher Education last year reported, has reduced the purchasing power of the colleges' dollar by nearly 50 percent. Meanwhile, the need to build new plants, new laboratories, and research facilities to keep up with the fast pace of development in scientific research has forced colleges to spend far more.

We must rely upon higher education to supply us with the professional, business, and scientific talent which our country desperately needs if it is to keep pace with economic and scientific developments in the rest of the world. If we fail to produce trained men in these fields we can look forward to dependence upon other nations for military and industrial research. And we can look forward to being outdistanced in these vital fields by the Soviet Union, which places a high priority on training for careers in these fields. If we are outdistanced by the Soviet Union in these fields we shall forfeit our scientific and industrial leadership of the world. And we shall then forfeit our safety, and perhaps our freedom.

Nor is training in the humanities and the social sciences any less vital than scientific

and professional training today. We have no better weapon with which to combat communism as a doctrine and ideology, than the education of our people. The United States will be free so long as our people are educated to freedom. We shall lead the free world so long as our people are educated to know and understand the world and its tremendous problems. If our education deteriorates, we will be in danger of deteriorating as a Nation.

The revenues from offshore oil can be used to stay the critical financial situation of American education. We will be short-sighted indeed, if we let such an opportunity slip by us. We are not likely to find another such opportunity very soon. We may not find it soon enough to save our educational system.

The oil for education amendment will provide for the most pressing needs of education without increasing our tax burden. And there is, moreover, ample historical precedent for this proposal.

Many of the American colonies used funds from public lands to provide for schools. After the Revolution, many of the States pressed claims to our territories west of the Appalachian Mountains. Congress, however, did not cede these lands to the States, but in 1780 passed a resolution to the effect that these lands would be used for the benefit of all the people.

The Northwest Ordinances of 1785 and 1787, were landmarks in the history of American education. These ordinances set aside every 16th section of the public lands of the Northwest Territory, for purposes of schools and education. As States were formed from the Territory, Congress set aside lands for the support of their school systems, as well as funds to establish and support the 'land-grant colleges' which are among our greatest centers of learning today as State universities.

The Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862 continued this tradition. It gave to every State 30,000 acres of land, or land scrip, for each Senator or Representative of that State in the Congress. More land-grant colleges throughout the country were established and supported by this act, including Cornell University, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and many others. The Second Morrill Act of 1900 provided permanent support for the land-grant colleges. And the Homestead Act of 1900 provided that where land revenues were insufficient to support land-grant colleges and agricultural experiment stations, other Federal funds could be used.

This is the tradition which has given the United States the most extensive, the most democratic, higher education system in the world. It is the tradition which has helped many American universities which have pioneered in much scientific, industrial, and military research—research to which we likewise owe our victory in the last war.

The oil for education amendment, now before the Senate, stands squarely in this tradition. It is an opportunity for us to continue that tradition, and to expand it, at a time when our educational needs are desperate. If we are wise, I submit we shall make the most of this opportunity.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2112) to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 24, 1953, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2032. An act to modernize the charter of Washington Gas Light Co., and for other purposes; and

S. 2112. An act to provide for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTI- NENTAL SHELF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] as a substitute for section 9, as amended.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would that involve the readoption of the Hill amendment, or is this another amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The adoption of the Hendrickson amendment, as a substitute, would mean that it would take the place of the language of section 9, as amended.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the question should come to a yea-and-nay vote, if I desired to vote for the continuance of the Hill amendment would I do so simply by voting "yea"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator should vote "nay" in that event.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thought the Chair stated that it was a substitute.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. If a Senator favors the amendment to which the Senate has just agreed, the amendment offered on behalf of 34 other Senators and myself, he should vote against the substitute. He should vote "nay" on the Hendrickson amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement of the senior Senator from Alabama is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Chair. Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator from South Dakota correctly understand that the vote now comes on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] for himself and me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota believes that a statement should be made as to the difference between the two proposals.

I regret that the Senator from New Jersey is unable to be present at this time.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] some weeks ago made a commitment to speak at anniversary ceremonies in his State. He had hoped that the vote on his amendment would come before he had to leave the Chamber or after he had returned.

I wish he were here to make the statement which I feel impelled to make at this time.

Essentially the difference between the amendment on which the Senate will now vote and the amendment which has been adopted is in the method of distribution.

The Senate has voted for the principle of applying the revenues from the Continental Shelf to the cause of education. The amendment which was offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], for himself and several other Senators, including myself, provides that the money "shall be appropriated exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; provided, however, that during the present national emergency, but not for more than 3 years, the moneys in such special account may be appropriated for such urgent developments essential to the national defense as the Congress may determine."

The main issue was, of course, whether the receipts should be dedicated to the cause of education. The amendment which the Senate had adopted makes them available as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education without specification as to the method of the distribution for that purpose.

There is only one issue involved, and that is whether or not the money shall be dedicated, without any specification as to the method of distribution, but simply paid for grants-in-aid to primary, secondary, and higher education, or whether the method of such payment shall be determined by Congress and should be determined in this manner; namely, that "within 90 days after the termination of the fiscal year in which received" it shall be paid "to the several States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia in an amount to each such State and Territory and the District of Columbia which bears the same ratio to the total of such rentals, royalties, and other sums received during such year (less the total of such refunds during such year) as the total number of individuals enrolled in the schools in such State or Territory or the District of Columbia according to the latest Federal Census bears to the total number of individuals enrolled in the schools in all such States and Terri-

tories and the District of Columbia according to such Census. Payments received under the provisions of this section shall be used by such States and Territories and the District of Columbia solely for the purposes of primary, secondary, and higher education."

Mr. President, personally I favor the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], as spelling out the method of distribution.

The Senate has already voted that these receipts, after 3 years, shall be dedicated to the cause of primary, secondary, and higher education.

The Hendrickson amendment spells it out by saying that the distribution shall be on the ratio of the school census. Personally I favor that method, because it seems to me to eliminate any controversy over the control of education. If the distribution is based upon a per capita basis, determined by the school census, there is eliminated to the maximum extent possible any controversy over the question of whether the Federal Government is entering into and dictating to the States in the field of education. It makes the money available to the States, and each State then can distribute the money within the State on the basis of the standards used by the State for the distribution of its own school funds.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Would the Federal census include the school population of private schools?

Mr. CASE. Yes. The language of the bill reads: "As the total number of individuals enrolled in the schools in such State or Territory or the District of Columbia, according to the latest Federal census," and so forth.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to have a categorical answer. Is it a fact that all students in private schools would be considered in the formula to be used in respect to the amount of money that would be paid to each State, to be spent by it according to its own law?

Mr. CASE. Yes; it would be the equivalent of a school census in the various States of the students enrolled in the schools of the States. The distribution within the State would depend upon the State law. In my own State, in the distribution within the State, we use the formula stated in the pending bill in determining the apportionment of the money that comes from the endowment law. We have some lands in our State which were granted to the State of South Dakota when it was admitted into the Union, and the proceeds from the leasing of those lands and the income from the leased funds received from the sale of those lands go into the school fund, and the school fund is apportioned to the school districts of the State on the basis of the number of children of school age within each school district. Every year we take an annual census of children of school age, and each school district has an entitlement in proportion to the number of children within the school district to the total number of children of school age within the State.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I correct in understanding that the difference between the amendment which the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] offer and the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], which has been adopted, lies in the fact that the Hill amendment provides merely for setting the money aside, awaiting further action in regard to its distribution among the States, whereas the Case amendment provides for the actual distribution of the funds among the States, and does not require any further legislative action?

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Case amendment should be adopted, the States would immediately begin to benefit from the law the year following the receipt of any income?

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Whereas, under the Hill amendment it would be necessary for Congress to provide some means of distribution before the States could actually begin to share in the benefits?

Mr. CASE. That is correct. In order to avoid confusion, perhaps we should refer to the pending amendment as the Hendrickson amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well. I did not notice which name was appended to it. As this money is distributed to the States, it will be used by the States in the same manner they use their own school funds. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE. That would be up to the States. The money would go to the States and Territories and the District of Columbia solely for the purpose of primary, secondary, and higher education. Those are the same words that are used in the Hill amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. But in the same way as the States spend their own funds?

Mr. CASE. That would be up to the States. Presumably that would be so.

Mr. AIKEN. It is in accord with the method which was twice approved by this body during recent years, each time by a vote of 58 to 13, as I recall.

Mr. CASE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Under the terms of the pending amendment, is it perfectly clear and definite that Indian children will be included in the school census and in the totals which are arrived at for each State? As I read the language, I believe that is the intent, but I should like to have it written into the Record at this point, because in legislative matters Indians have the unhappy faculty of finding themselves on the sidelines. Therefore I should like to have incorporated in the debate the clear statement that they are to be included in the school census.

Mr. CASE. I am glad to have my distinguished colleague bring up that point, but there can be no misunderstanding about it. Line 17 on page 2 of the bill reads: "As the total number of individuals enrolled in the schools in such

State or Territory or the District of Columbia," and so forth. Certainly Indians are individuals enrolled in the schools.

Mr. MUNDT. I am convinced of it. However, while people sometimes think Indians are not citizens, I hope no one will allege that they are not individuals, and as such would be included in the school census.

Mr. CASE. They very definitely would be included.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to find out the real distinction between the two amendments. As I understood, the Hill amendment provides for a general allocation of the income, if any, grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education. In the opinion of the Senator from South Dakota, will the grants-in-aid require matching in any way?

Mr. CASE. The amendment does not so provide. Probably the Senator from Alabama should give an authoritative answer on that point. I shall be glad to have him make answer.

Meantime, I point out that beginning at the bottom of page 1 of the Hill amendment, the following appears:

Such moneys shall be appropriated exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

So that matter would have to be handled by means of an appropriation bill or other legislation in the future.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota will permit me to do so, I should like to respond to the question of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CASE. Certainly; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. I was asking whether further action would be required in connection with the grants-in-aid, as provided by the Hill amendment.

Mr. HILL. Congress would have to determine what future action should be taken. Under our amendment, these funds are dedicated to education. Congress would have to enact subsequent legislation providing a means of allocating the funds. This amendment is merely a dedication of the funds to education, and subsequently there would have to be enabling legislation.

Mr. FERGUSON. If Congress did not make arrangements for the distribution of the funds, no distribution would be made under the Hill amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. Yes; Congress would have to act. The amendment itself does not provide for the allocation.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Hill amendment uses the words "grants-in-aid."

Mr. HILL. They must be grants-in-aid to primary, secondary, and higher education; but the means or basis of the distribution would have to be determined by Congress by means of subsequent legislation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Alabama also agree that the Hendrickson-Case amendment would permit such a distribution to be made at once?

Mr. HILL. I agree that it would attempt to have the distribution made at once, but I believe it would result in having the distribution made in the wrong way.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator from Alabama agree to the method for the distribution proposed by that amendment?

Mr. HILL. I do not. I am very much opposed to the Hendrickson-Case amendment for that reason. In a moment I shall speak on that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall await the Senator's remarks.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is not the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from South Dakota the only amendment before us which provides that the net receipts from the outer Continental Shelf shall be paid to the several States for primary, secondary, and higher education?

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Oregon has made a valid point, and he has quoted practically verbatim from the amendment, because it provides, in part:

After the termination of such national emergency shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury, within 90 days after the termination of the fiscal year in which received.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is not the so-called Hendrickson-Case amendment the one amendment which on its face guarantees that there will not be any interference by the Federal Government in connection with the payment of such funds? In other words, is not the amendment in itself complete?

Mr. CASE. That is true. Personally, my position is that I have been in favor of dedicating to education the revenues from these mineral resources. My position on that point was determined and established several years ago, before I became a Member of the Senate. I have consistently voted for amendments which worked in that direction. I voted for, and am a sponsor of, the Hill amendment because I believed it worked in that direction.

However, after some study of the question, I reached the conclusion that we should not leave the distribution to the vagaries of different Congresses, if we could possibly avoid doing so; we should not leave to the passing whims of different Congresses the determination of which of the various methods of appropriation and distribution, in various degrees, should be used or followed. Certainly I do not believe the Federal Government should tell the States how to use the money or how to divide it as between primary, secondary, and higher education.

I believe the money should be turned over to the States, and the States should be permitted to decide how it would be used for education, inasmuch as the States are nearer to the educational problems. The States themselves should be permitted to determine how much of

the money they wished to devote to primary education, how much to secondary education, and how much to higher education.

That is why I have favored, and now favor, the method of apportioning the funds, that is provided by the so-called Hendrickson-Case amendment, so as to permit the States to determine how the funds shall be apportioned, and so as to permit the control of education to rest in the States, where it now rests.

Mr. CORDON. Is it not true that the so-called Case-Hendrickson amendment is the only amendment before the Senate which provides any yardstick or standard for allocation of the funds among the several States?

Mr. CASE. That is true, and the amendment does so on the simple basis of the number of students enrolled in the schools.

Mr. CORDON. Without that standard or some other standard, obviously the funds could not be apportioned. Is that not correct?

Mr. CASE. That is correct. Otherwise, every time the appropriation came up, the Federal Government could establish a different method of distributing the funds, and again we would be faced with the question of Federal control of education.

Although I am wholly in sympathy with the idea of having these funds used for education, and have consistently voted for such use, both when I served in the House of Representatives and during my service in the Senate, I believe we should firmly decide about this matter, or should firmly "nail it down," if possible, and should do so on the self-evident basis and the fair basis of the ratio between the total number of individuals enrolled in the schools of a particular State or Territory and the total number of individuals enrolled in the schools of all States and Territories and the District of Columbia, according to the Census.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURCELL in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. If the Hendrickson-Case amendment prevails, what control will the Federal Government have over education in the States?

Mr. CASE. None whatever—no more than the Federal Government has today.

Mr. FREAR. What students would be included and how would a census be made?

Mr. CASE. The amendment provides:

Individuals enrolled in the schools in such State or Territory or the District of Columbia according to the latest Federal census.

Mr. FREAR. Will both private and public schools be included?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Do the words "higher education" include colleges and universities?

Mr. CASE. Yes; because later the amendment states: "solely for the purposes of primary, secondary, and higher education."

The amendment also refers to "the total number of individuals enrolled in the schools in such State or Territory or the District of Columbia."

Mr. FREAR. Suppose a student from Delaware entered a college in Pennsylvania. Which State would receive remuneration for him?

Mr. CASE. The allocation would be made on the basis of the location of the school. If a student from the District of Columbia entered a school in Delaware, Delaware would receive credit for that student.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question.

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. This question may have been covered heretofore. However, under the amendment, the State of New Jersey would receive all the money for the students at Princeton University, would it not?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. So under the amendment, the inevitable consequence would be that the larger portion of the funds would be given to the larger and richer States. Is not that true?

Mr. CASE. I think one would have to have the enrollment figures, in order to determine that.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; but would not the inevitable result of the amendment be that it would give the greater proportion of the funds to the larger States, and therefore the richer States?

Mr. CASE. That would not necessarily be so. I think we would have to analyze the figures, in order to reach a determination on that point.

Mr. GEORGE. At any rate, New Jersey would be given credit for all the students at Princeton University, and Massachusetts would be given credit for all the students at Harvard University. Is not that true?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota if it is not true that practically every State has some rich and some poor school districts. In other words, some school districts have a high valuation, and some have a low valuation. Does not every State, in order to equalize the educational opportunities, allocate the funds under a so-called equalization method, in the case of the common-school funds? Is the Senator familiar with that?

Mr. CASE. In my State of South Dakota there is an equalization fund for the very purpose which the Senator mentioned.

Mr. HUNT. Let me ask the Senator does not that work very splendidly in equalizing educational opportunities?

Mr. CASE. It seems to work very well. In fact, we have maintained the practice for a number of years.

Mr. HUNT. Then does not the Senator agree with me that, instead of the Federal Government attempting to direct how the money shall be expended by

each individual State, we should allow the State legislatures and the State departments of public education to apply it in the best way, where it will do the most good?

Mr. CASE. That is exactly my contention.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In view of the fact that the only matters relating to this subject considered by the committee, and the only testimony given in the hearings, had to do with the disposition of the revenues from oil and gas on the outer Continental Shelf, and the purpose to which the funds would be devoted—that is, grants-in-aid to the States, or the reduction of the national debt—I wondered whether the Senator from South Dakota did not feel that the question of how the funds should be divided among the States ought to await further hearings and further consideration, in view of the many questions that have been raised here this afternoon.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota presented that matter during the debate on the original so-called tidelands bill. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] spoke on the issue at that time. At page 5796 of the RECORD of June 1 appears a statement by the Senator from New Jersey, in which is incorporated a letter which the Senator from New Jersey addressed to the Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. So, this matter is not new. It has been presented before, and this particular issue was developed in the committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the Senator feel that the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, as to what State should be charged with responsibility for a student residing in one State but going to school in another State, and many other questions of that sort, should be inquired into and detailed testimony taken before a decision is reached? I cannot find any such testimony in the hearings on the pending bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The question of the distribution of funds under Federal-aid-to-education proposals has been the subject of testimony before committees of this body for weeks and months, during the past few years. To boil it all down, the method of distributing the funds according to enrolled school population is very fair. I do not have the figures for this year, but 3 or 4 years ago I think New York would have received about 20 percent of the money based on the number of enrolled school children. The larger States, which pay greater amounts in taxes, would get more of the money. New York State pays about 23 percent of the Federal tax. Other States pay varying percentages. But let me state where the difference arises.

The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota would allocate the money

according to the number of children in each State who are attending school. During the past few years we have had proposals to allocate the funds according to the number of children of school age; and there is a difference between those criteria, because some States are more assiduous in requiring school attendance than are other States. It is true that the States that require all their children to attend school, and enforce their truancy laws, would fare better under the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota than would those that are lax in enforcing the truancy laws, and do not require such regular attendance. That is the difference. But if we boil it down and go through the figures, as we have gone through reams of them within the past few years, it will be found that distribution on the basis of actual school attendance is a pretty fair method of distribution. If we try to require funds to be distributed in any way other than that in which each State uses its own school funds, we shall then get into difficulties. We shall be beset by lobbyists for this group and that.

As I stated earlier, the Senate has twice passed bills providing for Federal aid to education. We passed each of the bills by a vote of 58 to 13; and each time the bill provided that each State should spend the money in the same manner in which it spent its own money. But there is a difference between allocating the money on the basis of children of school age, and allocating it on a basis of school attendance; and I think there ought to be a difference.

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. There should be an incentive to send children to school.

Mr. CASE. I may say to the Senator that there is some argument for that position. In my own State, we found that when we apportioned our funds on that basis, the people in the several districts manifested more assiduity in seeing that their children were enrolled. It helps to create respect for the truancy law.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I shall yield to the Senator from Kentucky in a moment, but before doing so, I wish to make one change in the amendment. I make this change on my own responsibility, not having had an opportunity to confer with the Senator from New Jersey about it.

My original understanding of the amendment was that the enrollment would apply to the primary and secondary schools, up to the 12th grade. Until the question of the Senator from Georgia was asked, and until I answered that question, I would have had that understanding, but when I examined the amendment, I observed that when reference was made to enrollment in the schools, it would include by implication all classes of schools, primary, secondary, and the higher classes, which I may refer to as higher education.

My intent in discussing the amendment with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] was that the enrollment should apply to those who were enrolled in the primary and secondary schools.

So, Mr. President, under what I understand to be my right as a cosponsor of the amendment, and spokesman for the Senator from New Jersey, I would modify the amendment, so that in line 17, on page 2 it would read, "As the total number of individuals enrolled in the primary and secondary schools in such State and Territory or the District of Columbia according to the ratio that the latest Federal census bears to the total number of individuals enrolled"; and at that point to strike out the word "the" and insert "such", so that it would read, "enrolled in such school."

The question raised by the Senator from Georgia about counting the students who are enrolled in higher institutions of learning would then be avoided. Such students would not be counted. The distribution would be based upon enrollment of the students in primary and secondary schools. That would avoid the fear of overweighting it in favor of a State in which there was a large university attended by students from outside the State. Is that perfectly clear?

Mr. President, am I within my right in so modifying the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is within his rights, and may modify the amendment accordingly.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota whether one effect of his amendment, if it should be adopted, would be to nullify the idea upon which Federal aid-to-education bills have been based; namely, that out of the sums of money set aside for aid to education—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order. We are unable to hear all of the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Kentucky may now proceed.

Mr. COOPER. I voted for the Hill amendment, and, also, when I was a Member of the Senate before, I was a cosponsor with the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and other Senators of the Federal aid-to-education bill. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota if it is not a fact that those bills were based upon the idea that out of appropriations there should be allocated to the States, whose educational standards were below a certain minimum, funds in varying amounts, determined by need and other standards, to provide in those States a minimum expenditure for each schoolchild? I am certain the Senator is familiar with the principle and the philosophy upon which those bills were based.

Is it not true, worthy as the Senator's proposal may be, that if his amendment should be adopted, it would in effect

nullify the principle upon which the Federal aid-to-education bills were based; namely, the principle of giving aid to those States where a minimum educational opportunity has not been provided, upon the basis of need? Would it not be true that, to a degree, it would freeze present inequalities of educational opportunity among the States?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I could not accept that statement as being the complete story. I think it is perhaps true that some bills have been predicated on the idea of giving aid to the States with small economic resources. There have been different formulas. But that very fact points up the weakness in the Hill amendment, namely, that it makes subject to perpetual review the amount which will go to the various States. When we make grants-in-aid we base them upon that point.

I once had that kind of formula in a bill which I introduced in the House of Representatives, but after receiving protests from school superintendents and from persons who saw some possibility of the Federal Government's securing a controlling hand over the kind of education which would be offered by the schools in the various States to which aid might be granted, I abandoned it in favor of a per capita distribution, because it seemed to me that it kept the long arm of the Federal Government out of control of the little red schoolhouse. It seemed to me that it was more desirable to preserve local control over education in the States.

As the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] has so well pointed out, the problem of schools with lesser opportunities or with smaller resources is a problem within the States, and the States can take care of it and place the money where it is most needed, without the Federal Government reaching the long arm of Washington's bureaucracy into the administration of local schools.

Mr. COOPER. A great many of the States have the so-called equalization principle. The very purpose of that principle is to allocate to areas within a State additional funds so that there may be educational equality of opportunity within the States. The Federal aid-to-education bills, as I remember, were bottomed on that idea. The Federal Government, in an effort to give aid or greater aid to areas which do not possess sufficient taxable wealth to provide educational funds, had in mind the equalization of educational opportunity throughout the country. That was the purpose of the Federal Government's entering into the field of education. The point I am raising—and, of course, I am aware that the Senator's amendment does make funds available to the States—is that the amendment kills the idea of the allocation of funds for the purpose of equalizing educational opportunity throughout the Nation.

Mr. CASE. I am glad the Senator has raised the issue. The amendment does kill the idea of the Federal Government's endeavoring to equalize, but it does not kill the idea of equalizing educational opportunity within the States. That is reserved to the States. Members of the Senate who believe in States' rights, who

believe in retaining for the States and local school districts the determination of courses of study under the laws of the States, should be in favor of this amendment, because it does not destroy the idea of helping the districts which are a little behind or which are handicapped. It permits the States to make the determination, and not the Federal Government.

One thing which has entered into the whole discussion about Federal aid to education is the great fear which has been voiced by lay and clerical leaders, that when we have Federal aid to education we raise the specter of Federal controls of education. We try to reserve that power to the States and, through the States, to the local school districts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is the Senator from South Dakota about to yield the floor?

Mr. CASE. I shall be glad to yield the floor at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. For while I appreciate the good motives and fine intentions of these Senators, their amendment involves a matter of delusive simplicity in dealing with one of the most complicated questions that can be presented.

The amendment proposes that the funds available for education be allocated between the States according to the relative number of enrolled pupils in all schools, public and private, in primary and secondary institutions.

Mr. President, there are many weaknesses in this formula, and they have been touched upon during the debate. In the first place, while the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has somewhat reduced the weakness of his formula by striking out higher institutions of learning from the basis of allocation, nevertheless, there is also a sectional element in connection with secondary education. There are many students from the West and Middle West who go to eastern and northern primary and secondary schools.

Therefore, this formula, while it is not quite so bad as that which was originally advanced, does discriminate against States where children of well-to-do families go East and North for their secondary education.

In the second place—

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. Having a great admiration for the knowledge possessed by the Senator from Illinois with reference to school and college matters, I should like to say to him, following the statement with a question, that we are at the present time in the throes of organizing a compact between 11 Western States with reference to higher education as it pertains to the professions of medicine and dentistry. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if he thinks the pending amendment would work disadvantageously to my State of Wyoming with reference to education in medicine and dentistry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would say that under the modification which the Senator from South Dakota has attached, it would not do so in the case just cited because, as I understand, he has now ruled out students in higher institutions of learning, so that the issue is simply as to the relative numbers in primary and secondary schools.

Mr. HUNT. Then, I understand the Senator to say that in the particular situation of which I speak, in which we contemplate making up the additional costs of education over and above tuition—and let me say that instruction in medicine and dentistry costs a student approximately from \$3,000 to \$3,600 a year—we would receive, under the pending amendment, an amount much smaller than our expense in educating boys in medicine and dentistry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The former amendment would have discriminated against Wyoming; but now that it has been modified there is no discrimination on this point. But to the degree that Wyoming boys go to Groton or St. Marks or St. Paul, or to some school in California, there would be discrimination. Massachusetts and California would get the money for the Wyoming boys.

In the second place, as the Senator from Vermont mentioned, average attendance is a much better unit of measurement for allocating funds than enrollment. If the mere numbers enrolled were to be considered, it would be to the advantage of a State to have a large number of children enrolled, but not to enforce the attendance laws.

Senators who have been governors—and I suppose that about a third of the membership of the Senate are former governors—will realize the importance of this factor in dealing with a distribution formula within a State. Average attendance is a much better formula than total enrollment. This is true between, as well as within, States.

In the third place there is the very vexing question of the relationship of private educational institutions to public educational institutions. This is the most difficult issue with which we have to deal, and we should be fair to both groups. I can only say that a very large and thoroughly patriotic section of the American community believes that a formula which is used simply to turn money over to States on the basis of total enrollment in all schools is an unfair formula.

Connected with that issue are all kinds of subsidiary issues, such as the financing of the transportation of pupils, health care, school books, and the maintenance and construction of the schools themselves. This democracy of ours will have to work out a solution of these problems. I think a solution can be worked out in time, but I am quite certain that the formula here proposed is not the solution. I believe that if it is persisted in, it will not only set back the cause of education, but will also create cleavages in our society, which we do not wish to have.

Finally, the formula has no relationship to the taxing ability of the various States to support education. While there are vast differences within States

there are also great differences between States. I hope my friends from the South will not object if I say that, on the whole, the per capita income, or average income, per school child is appreciably lower in the South than it is in the North. Figures for the late 1940's indicated that the taxable income, or income per school child, was approximately one-third in Mississippi what it was in Connecticut or New York. That difference is being narrowed, thank the Lord. Perhaps now the ratio is nearer one-half than one-third, but the differences are very appreciable.

I am well aware of the fact that my own State of Illinois would get a larger total sum of money in a distribution made according to school population than if the need factor were taken into account. Nevertheless, I have discussed the issue with people in my State, and I think the general sentiment is that areas of the country which are in greater need should be helped to bear their burdens. An examination of the figures will disclose that the Southern States spend a larger fraction of their income for education than do most of the Northern and Western States. There is nothing wrong with the South in their readiness to support education. They simply do not have a large per capita income which they can tax. It is lack of means and not lack of will which holds them back.

I submit that this is a national issue, and that those of us who come from wealthier States should help bear this burden, for two reasons. In the first place, many issues with which Congress deals are national issues. From the standpoint of national defense and a wise citizenry it is to the advantage of us all that young Americans everywhere should have good health and a decent minimum of education. I believe it is the national responsibility, not to have an absolute equality of educational opportunities, but to give at least a minimum of educational opportunities to all—a minimum below which no citizen will fall. I may say that this can be achieved without any Federal control whatsoever of the context of education. I would be opposed to that.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I first finish my statement? Then I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Secondly, there is a migration of labor from the South to the North, and now to the West, so that States which bear the burden of educating children do not necessarily inherit the citizens whom they train. That has been one of the great difficulties of the counties in the Appalachian Mountain area, so to speak, which runs through so many States. The children from those counties must be educated by the counties, but when the children become adults, they go North and West, and there is an erosion of population. I say that in no invidious sense whatsoever. Therefore, the States which inherit this population should help bear the burden of educating the population which comes to them. Believe me, that is no theoretical issue for us in Illinois. I shall not go further into that

matter, but Senators, by using their imagination, can understand what I mean.

Therefore, while it would be to the narrow economic advantage of my State to have the formula proposed by the Senator from South Dakota, I do not believe it would be in the national interest, and in the long run I do not believe it would be in the interest of Illinois or of the wealthier States.

I do not wish to finish by piously quoting Scripture, if it is not appropriate to do so. However, it is certainly true that within our Nation the principle is correct that we should "bear one another's burdens," at least within limits. The low income of the South is not the fault of the South; it has been the result, partly, of historical accident, and also of high tariffs and high railroad rates that the North has imposed upon the South. If there is to be a reconciliation of the sections of the country, it is about time we swept away those impediments, on the one hand, and assumed some national responsibility for sectional difficulties which have been created by forces beyond sectional control.

I yield now to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Illinois is a great economist, and is so recognized on the basis of his studies. Would he say that larger families occur among people of high income, or is it not true that larger families are found among people of relatively lesser income?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly that was true up until 10 years ago. Of course, there is now a tendency for those with higher incomes to have more children than they did formerly.

Mr. CASE. Is it not possible that that fact would modify the fear that the Senator has expressed, that the South would not fare a little better under this amendment, if it is based upon school population?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It may be that those forces will work themselves out in the long run. However, in the short run the fact is that Southern incomes per schoolchild are, say, half what the average incomes are in the wealthier Northern States, and somewhat below the national average. As I say, that is not the fault of the South. It is simply a matter of fact. In view of that fact, I think that we in the North and the West should assume some degree of national responsibility.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to commend the Senator from Illinois for one of the finest statements I have ever heard on this subject from a national viewpoint. He has not only accurately stated the facts with reference to this matter, as I see them, but has also stated them fairly.

My State of Mississippi is frequently pointed to as being at the bottom of the low-income group. However, a few years ago my State voted the highest proportion of its taxable dollar to education of any State in the Nation. It is

now not far from the top in that category.

We are not particularly asking for aid to our educational programs. Certainly we are not begging for aid. I am very glad to support the Hill amendment, because I believe it will be worked out on a proper basis by the time the money gets to the individual schools.

I wish especially to commend to all Senators the excellent statement made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] with respect to the problem and the facts in connection with what I believe to be a sound national course to pursue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. He is one of the finest and most considerate gentlemen I have known. All of us should understand that the Hill amendment does not commit Congress to any formula. It does provide time in which to work out a formula. The issue is so complicated that we need time in which to consider it and to try to reconcile the various groups. We should not hurriedly vote into effect the delusively simple formula of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], which, upon examination, is seen to have so many unfairnesses in it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, we have a very clear question before us this afternoon. I am not impressed with the argument against the Case amendment. I am not impressed with the statement of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that we need more time—more time—more time. We have held hearings on the question of Federal aid to education lasting literally over months. At last we have an opportunity to show to those interested in schools and education whether we really favor Federal aid to education or whether we have seized upon the Hill amendment as a fat, juicy political issue which can be used over and over again for the next 10, 20, or 30 years. I say that the vote we take this afternoon on the Case amendment will show definitely whether or not we are sincere in voting for the Hill amendment.

We know all the little matters—and they are big matters to some people—which arise in a hearing. We know the religious issue which will be injected, and which has killed Federal aid to education more than once up to this time. We know the arguments which will be made for giving this State more, or that State more, or this type of school more, and the arguments as to what grades we should support.

The manner in which the Senator from South Dakota proposes to settle this problem is the only way that, within the next generation, we can succeed in giving any Federal aid to education. Do we believe in States' rights? If we do, let the States spend this money as they spend their own money, and not try to bind them by intricate formulas so that the Federal Government will tell them how to operate each and every school, from the primary grades up to the colleges.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I agree 100 percent with the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

This is an opportunity to show the country where we stand on this issue. We have an opportunity to do it. If we do not do it now, we shall not do it for perhaps the next generation, if ever; or if we do, we may do it in such a way that we shall sincerely regret our action.

What is the use of saying that we are going to give the States some money for education, and then limiting them so that they cannot obtain a cent of money? Let us give it to them if we are going to give it to them.

The proposal of the Senator from South Dakota is eminently fair. There is no such thing as an absolutely fair formula for the distribution of these funds; and any law we enact will be subject to ironing out the inequities through subsequent legislation. But if we want to provide money for education—and God knows, every school in the country, from the primaries through the universities, is desperately in need of funds—we shall never have a better opportunity to do it than we have now.

The proposal of the Senator from South Dakota might give one State a little more under this formula than it would receive under some other formula. However, as I have stated, no formula is exactly correct. The extension service is based upon rural population. I have heard no complaints as to the workings of that system. This proposal is based upon school enrollment. As the Senator from Illinois has said, school attendance would probably be a better measure in the long run. We can change the formula later. But let us show the country today that the Congress actually favors desperately needed Federal aid to education, and is not simply shadow-boxing by enacting legislation which will not give the States a single dollar until we wrangle through the next 10 or 20 years deciding how to apportion it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Am I correct in my view that the Hill amendment does not give anything to the schools?

Mr. AIKEN. Not a cent. I voted for it as a first step.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I voted against it, because I do not think it would accomplish anything.

Does the Senator agree with me that under the Hendrickson-case amendment there is an opportunity for those who have talked the most, and occupied the most time in the Senate asserting their desire to aid the schools, to provide an assurance that if there are to be any revenues from the Continental Shelf oil lands they will go to the schools? This is an opportunity for positive action along that line, is it not?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct.

It has been said that we should study the contributions for health, the contributions for transportation, and the contributions for this, that, and the other. I maintain that that is not the business of the Congress. That is the business of

each individual State. The States should use the Federal money in exactly the same way they use their own State money. If they spend State money transporting Catholic children to parochial schools, as some States do, or if they pay tuition to Methodist schools, as some States do, they should be permitted to do the same thing with this money. If we really want to maintain States' rights, certainly we must maintain them first in the field of education.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does it not seem to the Senator from Vermont to be rather inexplicable, or at least incompatible, that those who have talked the most about actually doing something for schools, and who now have an opportunity, are fighting the Case amendment, which would accomplish something?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know that it is inexplicable or incompatible, but I think it is entirely indefensible.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], however sincere they may be, and however earnest they may be, about trying to get some Federal aid for our schools, would be very unfair. It would count all children in all schools—both in the public schools, the nonpublic schools, and all private schools—but only the public schools would get the benefit. It would mean that the States which have many private schools would be receiving money on the basis of the enrollment in those private schools, but no money would go to the private schools.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator contend that any State should be deprived of the right to pay tuition to a private school?

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows that most of the States have provisions in their State constitutions that public funds shall not go to private schools.

Mr. AIKEN. Not most of them.

Mr. HILL. Yes. If the Senator will look at the History of Education, by Coverly, he will find a long list of them.

The Senator also knows that the Supreme Court of the United States said in the Everson case that public funds should not go to private schools.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator believe that by postponing this issue, the question of actually allocating the funds to the States, and continuing to quibble and quarrel over the method of distribution for the next 20 or 30 years, we shall be promoting the cause of education?

Mr. HILL. The Senator has gone into the field of imagination with all kinds of exaggerations.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not exaggeration.

Mr. HILL. I do not believe that it will require 20 years. I have full faith in the

Congress. I believe that if we dedicate the funds, as provided by the amendment just adopted, the Congress will meet its duty and responsibility and enact legislation providing a method and machinery for fair and equitable allocation of the funds.

The Case amendment provides that during the present national emergency the funds shall be used only for such urgent developments essential to the national defense and national security as the Congress may determine.

We do not know how long the national emergency may continue. Under the amendment which the Senate has just adopted, an amendment sponsored by some 35 Members of the Senate, and which I had the honor to offer, it is provided that for the period of the next 3 years the funds may be used for urgent developments essential to the national defense and the national security as the Congress may determine.

The Senate should know, and does know, that there are no funds immediately available. It will require time to bring about the development of the areas of the Continental Shelf. It will be some time before there will be any considerable funds. The Congress could not give the States any money from this source today, because the funds are not available. Time will be required to bring about development.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has indicated that the adoption of the Case amendment is necessary to lodge in the respective States the authority to disburse the money as each State sees fit. Is it not a fact that the Case amendment would determine how much of the money a State would get, not how the State would spend what it did get?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly right. Whenever the Senate has acted on the subject—and the last time was on the Taft bill, sponsored by the distinguished majority leader—the Senate has left it entirely to the States as to how the money shall be spent. We provided merely that the money shall be allocated to the States on a fair and equitable basis; so fair and equitable, that the vote on the bill was 59 in favor of it, as against 19 opposed to it, I believe.

What the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] would do would be to give the money to the States on what I think would be a wholly unfair basis, and it would be wholly unfair to the States.

It would be unfair to small States. The States with many private schools would get the bulk of the money, even though none of the money would be given to the private schools. If the Senator from Oklahoma sent his son to one of those secondary schools—and we know there are many of them in some States, such as Exeter, Groton, and others—his son would be counted against the money that would be given to the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Then it is a fact, is it not, that the defeat of the Hendrickson-Case amendment would not change the situation one iota with respect to the States still having full authority to disburse the money on the basis they saw fit to establish, and without any control by the Federal Government?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly right.

I do not wish to delay the Senate, and I do not wish to labor this question.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] put his hand on the crux of the whole thing when he asked the question about Princeton University. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] modified his amendment, but he did not change the purpose at all, because so far as secondary and elementary schools are concerned, they are still used as the basis. The children in all secondary and elementary schools, including those in private and nonpublic schools, are used as a basis in distributing the money to the States, but the money is expended only for the children in the public schools. Not one dollar can be given to the private schools. Those schools, nevertheless, are included in the basis. Many of the private schools are splendid schools, as we know, but only a few of them are located in the smaller States.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] spoke about the question of equalization. And the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] asked a question about it. I do not wish to labor the point, but I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a few words spoken by Mr. William G. Carr, executive secretary, National Education Association. He bases his statement on the study that had been made by a commission appointed by President Eisenhower when the latter was president of Columbia University. This is what Mr. Carr said:

One and one-half million young men out of 18 million registered for the Armed Forces during the last war presented a serious educational problem. The same report of The Uneducated—

That is the Eisenhower Commission report—

shows that this problem is closely related to the availability of good schools. The 12 States with the highest educational expenditure a decade earlier had a rejection rate during the war of 1.3 percent. That is rather low. The 12 States with the lowest educational expenditure a decade earlier had a rejection rate during the war of 9.1 percent. The same study declares, and I quote:

"It is beyond argument that the Armed Forces were handicapped in the scale and speed of their mobilization in World War II by being forced to make a series of special adjustments to cope with the very large number of illiterate and poorly educated persons in the draft eligible ages."

In other words, the States that did not have great taxable wealth had nine times as many rejectees as the wealthier States, even though the evidence, as given before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, shows that the low-income States are devoting a greater part of their income and taxable wealth

to education than are the high-income States.

As the Senator from Kentucky has so well said, what better evidence do we need that the Case amendment should not be agreed to than the fact that the Senator has been forced on the floor of the Senate to change his amendment? It has not been carefully considered or thought through. Any legislation providing for the distribution of these funds should be considered by the appropriate committee and should be carefully weighed and considered.

Mr. President, we know that in the early years these funds may not be large. It may not be to the national interest to spread them too thin. This afternoon I called attention to the fact that Dr. Waterman, the Chairman of the National Science Foundation, in testifying before the House Committee on Appropriations a few days ago, declared that in 1955 Russia would be turning out 50,000 engineers and we in the United States would be turning out fewer than 20,000 engineers. It may be wise from the standpoint of national defense—and, after all, Congress has no greater responsibility under the Constitution than to provide for the defense—in the early years, when the funds are small, to use them for a special purpose, such as the training of engineers, for example, who are vital to the defense of our country. We could not, in my judgment, do a more unwise thing and a more unfortunate thing than to adopt the Hendrickson-Case amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama—and I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] if he will give me his attention also—if we are seriously to consider the Hendrickson-Case amendment, making provisions for the distribution of the funds, whether the Senator from Alabama would agree with me, if we are to go into that phase of the subject in this proposed legislation, it would be wise to amend the pending amendment by inserting as subparagraph (c) at the end of the second page of the amendment, following line 25, the language which constitutes the policy provision or policy section of the Federal education bill, which the Senate has passed twice heretofore. It reads as follows:

Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or to prescribe any requirements with respect to any school, or any State educational institution or agency, with respect to which any funds have been or may be made available or expended pursuant to this act, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement or any other action taken under this act, whether by agreement or otherwise, relating to any contribution made under this act to or on behalf of any school, or any State educational institution or agency, or any limitation or provision in any appropriation made pursuant to this act, seek to control in any manner, or prescribe requirements with respect to, or authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to direct, supervise, or

control in any manner, or prescribe any requirements with respect to, the administration, the personnel, the curriculum, the instruction, the methods of instruction, or the materials of instructions, nor shall any provision of this act be interpreted or construed to imply or require any change in any State constitution prerequisite to any State sharing the benefits of this act.

Mr. President, that provision was written into the Federal-aid-for-education bill. I offered that provision as an amendment to the first Federal-aid-for-education bill which came before the Senate after I became a Member of the Senate. At that time the amendment was adopted. It has been included in every subsequent Federal-aid-to-education bill which has been introduced, so far as I know, or certainly in every such bill which has been passed by the Senate during that time.

In my opinion that provision not only is incidental to but is inseparable from any provision for the distribution of such funds. I am not willing to vote for any formula for the distribution without having that provision included or without having an even stronger one included, if a stronger one can be worded properly.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as the Senator from Arkansas has said, that provision has been included in every Federal-aid-to-education bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have read from the 1949 bill. Certainly that provision or an even stronger one, if one can be worked out from the point of view of States rights, is absolutely essential as a part of any measure by means of which we legislate in connection with the distribution of these funds.

Mr. HILL. That provision has been included in all such bills.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I believe that clarifies the matter. The amendment of the Senator from Alabama needs such a provision. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey and myself does not need it. That is the whole point. Of course, I have no objection to having that provision included.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Hill amendment does not provide for the distribution of the funds.

Mr. CASE. That is why it needs such a guaranty.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This provision is an indispensable part of any measure undertaking to make a distribution of the funds, whether it is undertaken under the Hill amendment or under the Hendrickson-Case amendment. If we are to protect the States and if we are to make certain that there will not be Federal control, such a provision must be included in the bill.

Mr. CASE. But the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey and myself provides that the funds shall be paid, and no condition is attached.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The provision I have stated seeks to make certain that no conditions can be attached.

I say to the Senator from South Dakota that if a satisfactory formula is worked out and is accompanied by these provisions, so as absolutely to protect

against any encroachment upon States rights, I would be inclined to go along with such a measure.

Mr. CASE. Personally, Mr. President, I have no objection to the inclusion of such a provision. I think it could very well be included in either amendment. Certainly such a provision needs to be included as a part of the Hill amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota accept this provision as an addition to or modification of his own amendment?

Mr. CASE. Certainly. I shall be glad to have it added to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this time the Senator from South Dakota cannot modify his amendment, inasmuch as the yeas and nays have been ordered, unless unanimous consent is given for that purpose.

Mr. CASE. But by means of unanimous consent, such a modification could be made, could it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota explain what he is trying to accept as a modification of his amendment?

Mr. CASE. I have said that I am perfectly willing to have the so-called McClellan amendment added as a part of or a modification of the so-called Hendrickson-Case amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota can modify his amendment at this time, if unanimous consent is given.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. What would the McClellan amendment do?

Mr. CASE. That amendment by very firm language attempts to state that no condition shall be attached to the use of the money, when it is distributed to the States.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope the Senator from South Dakota will accept such a modification of his amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the so-called McClellan amendment may be added as a modification of the so-called Hendrickson-Case amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota for that modification of the so-called Hendrickson-Case amendment, which is offered as a substitute for section 9 of the bill, as amended?

Hearing no objection, the modification will be made.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I wish to suggest an additional amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Let me say that the issue was never better stated than when it was stated by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who referred to the so-called Hill amendment as it compares with the so-called Hendrickson-Case amendment.

Both amendments provide that the purpose of granting the funds shall be

for primary, secondary, and higher education. The Senator from Oklahoma asked the Senator from Alabama whether it is true that the Hendrickson-Case amendment determines how much each State will receive, and not how each State shall spend the money. That is true, Mr. President.

Our amendment merely provides how much of the fund each State shall receive. Our amendment does not attempt to determine how the money shall be spent by the States.

The weakness and difficulty of the Hill amendment is that it attempts to reserve to Congress the right to say how the States shall spend the money. Certainly we should determine only how much help the Federal Government will give the States, and not how the States shall spend the money they receive. We should only provide the broad purposes for which the money shall be used.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that defeat of the Hendrickson-Case amendment would not in any way result in directing how the States shall spend the money, when and if they finally get any of it?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma is merely interested in defeating the amendment because it happens to be offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and myself, I reply that that would accomplish that purpose. The condition applying to the grant of these funds for the benefit of education has been established by a vote without regard to party alinement. I have voted for every amendment which has been offered, either to this bill or to the preceding bill, which had the purpose of making some of these revenues available in aid of education. The Senate is now on record, by reason of the votes of Senators on both sides of the aisle; and we should not speak in terms of defeating an amendment in order to accomplish a purpose.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to my distinguished friend from South Dakota that no Member of the Senate would be more persuasive to me by reason of being the author of an amendment. The Senator from Vermont, as I understand him, made an argument in favor of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from New Jersey, on the ground that the adoption of the amendment is necessary in order to free the States of Federal control of their educational operations under the benefits accruing from the provisions of this bill.

My question was only for the purpose of making it clear that under the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and his colleague from New Jersey, the main purpose is to provide a formula for determining what percentage of this money a State shall receive rather than to pro-

vide that each State shall be free from Federal control of its educational operations in connection with the expenditure of the money.

I submit to my good friend that in so doing, certainly no reflection was cast upon the amendment by reason of its authors, because so far as I am concerned, just the opposite would be the case.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate very much the statement the Senator from Oklahoma has made.

Mr. KERR. But I feel that this is not the time or the place—here on the floor of the Senate—to try to work out the formula. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that, as I understood it, the sole purpose of the amendment was to determine the percentage which an individual State would receive of the total amount, not to fix it so that it would be any more free of Federal control than it would be in the absence of the adoption of the amendment of the distinguished Senator.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, we do have the purpose of trying to avoid the question of determining how the States shall spend the money. The amendment clearly says that the money shall be paid to the States—period. It ends there. It does not say we will set up a system of grants-in-aid, with the conditions of the grants-in-aid to be determined later; it says the money shall be paid to the States, and it winds it up there.

What the Hill amendment proposes is to reserve to the Congress the question of determining later on how the money shall be spent, and what the conditions for the grants-in-aid shall be. I submit to the Senate that that we ought not to consider on the floor of the Congress of the United States the question of determining how the States shall spend the money after they get it. I yield the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I assure Senators that I shall not speak for more than a few moments. I shall not have time to discuss each of the points that have been raised in the debate. I have been interested in this subject for a long time, and, when I was in the Senate for a short period, in the 80th Congress, I joined, with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. ARKEN] and the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in the introduction of the Federal aid-to-education bill, which was passed by the Senate during the 80th Congress. Similar bills have passed the Senate.

I should like to make my position on this question clear. It has been suggested that those who have said they were interested in providing educational aid to the State would deny that interest if they oppose the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senators from South Dakota and New Jersey. To me there is a distinct difference in principle between the amendment proposed by my good friend from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] dedicates the proceeds of the royalty from the Continental Shelf to education, but does not

prescribe the method of allocation to the States. It holds the possibility of an allocation by the Congress to the States upon the basis of their need. The Case amendment does not consider the relative needs of the States but allocates to all on the same formula, needy or not. There is controversy about all these Federal-aid proposals. Some arise from the 1st amendment of the Constitution, made applicable to the States by the 14th amendment. There is also a fear of control by the Federal Government—a fear which most of us share.

It has always seemed to me that the best reason for appropriation of money by the Federal Government to the States in aid of education was to equalize educational opportunities among the States. The fact is that many States—and not through any fault of theirs but because of the lack of taxable wealth—have not been able to provide the funds necessary for adequate teaching, teachers' salaries, and for minimum educational standards for the children living within their boundaries. It has been said—and it is true—that if the Hendrickson-Case amendment is adopted, and if any money should be derived from the oil and other resources in the Continental Shelf, that at least some funds would be provided these needier States. But if this is done, we shall have adopted its formula and a principle which will not be later changed. It will preclude the application of the principle which has been the basis of the whole idea of Federal aid to education—the principle of variable allocations to the States, based on need.

There are many who do not agree with the principle. I am one of those who believe that it is the only method of providing a measure of educational equality throughout the country, a way of raising educational minimum standards in States of less taxable wealth. The principle of equalization between sections within a State has been adopted, as the Senator from South Dakota has said, by most of the States. The same principle of equalization between the States is the basis of the idea of Federal aid to education.

I would like to say, before I close, that while I voted against the Holland bill when it was considered heretofore, and while I voted for all amendments which would give aid to education within the States, I never believed that any great sums of money would become immediately available. I must say I was surprised, at times, by the exaggerated claims which were made as to the sums which would become available. But certainly some amounts will be available; I must say that, if we adopt the principle of the Hendrickson-Case amendment, worthy as it may be, so far as it provides some funds for education, it would deny and defeat the idea for which my good friend from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] fought, which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] fought, and for which many of us in the 80th Congress fought. That was to provide a formula which would in reality move toward equality of educational opportunity between the States, rather than merely a windfall to the States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], for himself and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], as a substitute for section 9, as amended.

Mr. CASE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, after consultation with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who suggested the absence of a quorum, and with his approval, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Am I correct in my understanding that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the pending amendment, which is the Hendrickson-Case amendment, as modified?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] for himself, and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], as a substitute for section 9, as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. LONG (after having voted in the negative.) I have a pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." Inasmuch as I have voted "nay," I permit my vote to stand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to at-

tend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—37

Aiken	Dworshak	Mundt
Beall	Ferguson	Payne
Bennett	Flanders	Schoeppel
Bricker	Goldwater	Smith, Maine
Bush	Griswold	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Thye
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Watkins
Capehart	Knowland	Welker
Carlson	Kuchel	Wiley
Case	Langer	Williams
Cordon	Malone	Young
Dirksen	Martin	
Duff	Millikin	

NAYS—42

Anderson	Hoey	Maybank
Chavez	Holland	McClellan
Clements	Hunt	Monroney
Cooper	Jackson	Murray
Daniel	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Purtell
Frear	Kefauver	Robertson
George	Kennedy	Russell
Gore	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Green	Lehman	Smathers
Hayden	Long	Sparkman
Hennings	Magnuson	Stennis
Hill	Mansfield	Symington

NOT VOTING—17

Barrett	Hendrickson	Morse
Bridges	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Kerr	Taft
Fulbright	Mccarran	Tobey
Gillette	McCarthy	

So the modified amendment offered by Mr. HENDRICKSON, for himself and Mr. CASE, as a substitute for section 9, as amended, was rejected.

"SMEAR IMPEACHMENT" TELEGRAMS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been waiting all afternoon to get a statement into the RECORD of a personal nature. I shall not trespass upon the time of the Senate very long, but I have a very distinct feeling that I must make this statement.

Mr. President, I am speaking today on the issue of a dastardly smear attack made against me.

It was made by an unidentified individual who sent a series of smear telegrams on Saturday, June 13, 1953, the day of the Wisconsin State Republican convention in Madison.

The telegrams were sent, as from a stealthy thief in the night, at 3:39 a. m., from Milwaukee, Wis., to 40 Republican county chairmen.

MEMO ON IMMIGRATION BILL

What about the immigration bill which "Benjamin Coleman" did not like?

It just so happens that this humanitarian bill, S. 1917, was recommended by the President of the United States.

Should not Benjamin Coleman, therefore, following his idiotic train of thought, have demanded impeachment of the President?

It just so happens that this bill was introduced at the request of the President by Senator WATKINS, chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee. Yet this very same Senator WATKINS, who is, incidentally, a conscientious man of deep religious faith, is the very sponsor by request of Senate Joint Resolution 43, which has now become, in effect, the revised Bricker amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 1.

In other words, Benjamin Coleman has demanded that I be impeached because I oppose Senator BRICKER's bill (which is really now the Watkins bill, or the American Bar Association bill). But in the next breath Benjamin Coleman lays his absurd basis for impeachment of Senator WATKINS himself because he introduced, at the President's request, the immigration bill.

This proves the utter ridiculousness to which the Benjamin Colemans of this country have gone.

In the next place, the bill is cosponsored by numerous other Senators who are at the same time cosponsors of the Bricker amendment. No doubt they, too, should be impeached, according to the inane judgment of Benjamin Coleman.

The cosponsors include some of the greatest names in the United States Senate, including our majority leader, ROBERT A. TAFT. There is no abler, finer, more devoted servant of this Republic than the senior Senator from Ohio. Is he now to be impeached?

Shall Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN be impeached?

Shall Senator WALLACE BENNETT, the past president of the National Association of Manufacturers, be impeached? Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Senator FRANK CARLSON, and all of the other cosponsors of S. 1917?

I think that I have made my point clear. We have seen the ultimate degree to which distorted thinking, poisoned emotions, reckless talk can go.

But what about S. 1917 itself?

This bill is far from perfect. No one claims that it is perfect. It is in the process of being redrafted.

I think that most of us who joined as cosponsors on it really endorsed simply its fundamental principles and objectives. We did not commit ourselves to all the details.

We hope the fundamental principles and objectives can be accomplished and in this particular session of the Congress. We hope the details of the bill can be worked out to the fullest satisfaction of all the men who have specialized in the immigration field.

I refer in particular to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. No legislator in the Senate or House has worked harder, longer and more earnestly on behalf of immigration legislation which he feels is appropriate for the best interests of our country. I am hoping that the doubts which PAT McCARRAN has on S. 1917 can be successfully and speedily resolved.

Remember, the bill is recommended by the three great religious faiths of our country. It is supported by many of our finest organizations.

I am personally particularly interested in it as a crucial element in American foreign policy. We all know that there are many lands across the seas which have deep grievances against our immigration laws.

But I too want to make sure that this or any other bill protects the best interests of our own country, first, last, and always, and I believe it does and will.

Several prominent organizations oppose the bill. They include many fine patriotic

groups. I hope their doubts can be resolved soon.

But I am sure that these groups, these responsible sources would be the first to condemn the poisoned thinking of the treacherous Benjamin Colemans of the Nation. Behind that thinking is a venom-filled well-spring, I believe of anticatholicism; anti-Semitism, and of other wretched concepts totally alien to the American way of life.

The Benjamin Colemans of this country deserve no respect on our part. Fairminded criticism does deserve respect in the American way.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet tomorrow during the session of the Senate.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to call up my amendments designated "6-23-53-A."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments offered by the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 25, in the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out the word "hereinafter" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "hereafter."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think it would save time if we were to take up these amendments individually. I think the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], in charge of the bill, will agree to most of them. This is one of them. It is only to correct a typographical error.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment of the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 9, it is proposed to strike out the words "the lines defining each such area" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "such projected lines extending seaward and defining each such area."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, with respect to this amendment, I have had an opportunity to discuss it with the Senator from Oregon, and I hope this language is satisfactory to him.

I will say to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon that this amendment deals with the committee amendment on page 4, line 9, and covers a very important point. We all recognize that it is very difficult to deal with the area referred to. While I believe the language in the bill reported by the Senator from Oregon is probably sufficient, many of us would feel safer if the language proposed in my amendment were adopted. If he has no objection to the language, I would appreciate his accepting the amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, as the Senator from New Mexico has stated, the amendment on page 4, line 9, is merely different language, used to describe the lines to be projected in order to divide the area in which the particular laws of a particular State is to be adopted. Perhaps it is clearer language than the language used in the bill. Certainly I have no objection to the clarifying language.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico explain what his amendment would accomplish?

Mr. ANDERSON. The original provision permitted the Secretary of the Interior, and a later change authorized the President of the United States to project the lines into the new area, that is, the lines beyond the historic boundaries of the States. The language read:

The President shall determine and publish in the Federal Register the lines defining each such area.

That language might have been construed to mean the historic boundaries of the States, which was obviously not the intention. We have tried to deal with the extension of the lines projected out into the Continental Shelf. The language is solely designed to make sure it is understood that these are lines projected out into the Continental Shelf, and do not interfere with the historic boundaries of the States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana is somewhat concerned about the way in which the boundaries would be projected at the point where the seaward line reaches a State's historic boundary. It has always seemed to the junior Senator from Louisiana that we should not attempt in this legislation to limit the power of the President, if he must have the power, to project the lines insofar as the direction of the lines are concerned.

For example, with respect to the State of Mississippi, if its law were made applicable, the State of Mississippi would find itself wedged in between Louisiana and Alabama, if the lines were projected at the angle at which they run at the point at which they reach the historic boundaries.

It might be more important that each State's line should be extended in a parallel fashion, or in a fashion which would give each State an amount of area on the Continental Shelf corresponding to the amount of coast line the State has, rather than to direct the lines at an angle.

Another situation occurs with regard to the States of Louisiana and Texas. The line at which the boundary runs where it reaches the coast is determined by a jetty which was built at the mouth of the Sabine River. Because the jetty happens to run in one direction for a certain number of yards does not mean that the State boundary should extend in that direction, if we are to extend the line for jurisdictional purposes.

Is the Senator from New Mexico attempting to limit the discretion of the President in trying to determine where the lines should be?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I am sure the Senator from Oregon will agree with me that all we have tried to do is to make sure that some agency will be able to reach out into that area and draw a line. We are perfectly satisfied that the President of the United States should do it. Undoubtedly he will do it on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior or some other responsible official. We are willing to leave it to his discretion. We are willing to leave to his discretion the manner in which the lines shall be projected seaward beyond the historic boundaries of the States.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Louisiana has stated the physical situation with reference to the lines between Louisiana and Mississippi. A similar problem exists on the east side of the State of Mississippi with reference to Alabama, where a continuation of those lines, Louisiana going eastward, and Alabama going westward, would preclude Mississippi altogether.

As I understand, the Senator from New Mexico does not, in the first place, try to alter the historic boundaries in any way by this amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. In the second place, this is merely discretionary power, to be used by the President of the United States, based on equitable lines and equitable considerations, rather than mere technical points. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. The real point is, I would say to the Senator from Mississippi, that the language in section 4 provides that Federal laws and regulations shall be applicable in the area, but that where there is a void, the State law may be applicable in the area that is on the Continental Shelf. Obviously someone must decide where the jurisdiction shall lie. Therefore, we feel the Secretary of the Interior would probably make the recommendations, but the President of the United States should have the authority to draw the line and promulgate it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator's amendment applies only to the bottom of the sea, so to speak, or whatever may be under the water, but has nothing to do with the fishing rights or regulations of the States, now or hereafter. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is my understanding. Does the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] agree? I am sure that is true. It is not an attempt to decide the fishing rights or anything of that nature.

Mr. President, I stated that the adoption of the amendment would relate only to the seabed, and would not in any way affect fishing rights. Does the Senator from Oregon agree?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from New Mexico is entirely correct. The lines would represent a necessary administrative action in order to adopt for the seabed and subsoil of the outer shelf the laws of the adjacent State. These laws,

by the terms of the act, are enacted as Federal law. None of the law so adopted or enacted in this measure applies to the waters above the seabed, nor in any way to the fishing rights.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield, so that I may address a question to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. As the Senator from Mississippi understands—and I want to be certain that the Senator from Oregon understands it the same way—the proposed amendment would have nothing to do with the existing fishing rights, as they now exist under the laws of the States, or as they may be hereafter adjusted by law or regulation.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] on page 4, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, between lines 6 and 12, it is proposed to strike out all of subparagraph (a), and on line 13 to strike out "(b)."

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have no particular objection to the elimination of the language proposed to be stricken by the amendment. The language was contained in the original measure presented to the Senate last year in Senate Joint Resolution 20, the O'Mahoney-Anderson measure in the 82d Congress, and again by the bill introduced in this Congress by the able Senator from New Mexico himself, S. 107.

Those measures granted to the Secretary of the Interior, upon approval of the Attorney General, the power to declare that any particular leased area was inside or outside the inland waters, using substantially the same language that the Senator now proposes to strike.

When the language was adopted to the pending bill, S. 1901, it gave the same authority to the Secretary of the Interior, on the approval of the Attorney General, stating:

The Secretary is authorized, with the approval of the Attorney General of the United States and upon the application of any lessor or lessee of a mineral lease issued by or under the authority of a State, its political subdivision, or grantee, on submerged lands, to certify that the area covered by such lease does not lie within the outer Continental Shelf.

The purpose of the language is to give to someone in authority the right to certify, in cases where there was no real controversy between the States on the one hand and the Federal Government on the other, with respect to the location of a given leased property inside a State's seaward boundary. Thus, it would permit development of such an area.

Objection has been raised by the Senator from New Mexico with reference to

the granting of this power to the Secretary of the Interior.

S. 1901 is a sound measure, in my opinion, either with or without that language.

Mr. ANDERSON. The language was included originally under greatly different conditions than those with which we are now dealing in the outer-shelf bill. It was proposed because of the situation in California; we were trying to deal with the situation in the Long Beach area, where there is a well-defined harbor and a bay, and therefore, inland water. But I do not believe that language really belongs in this bill for the outer Continental Shelf, which is something quite different.

I appreciate having the Senator from Oregon include it, from Senate bill 107, which I introduced; but I think all of us would feel that it would be safer if that provision were not included in this measure at this time. At least, I am of that opinion.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico explain the amendment? I do not understand the difference between the bill with the amendment and the bill without the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. First, in my opinion the provision is not needed in order to make S. 1901 a sound measure.

Second, there is a possibility that the Secretary of the Interior could—I am not accusing him of having such an intention, because I have the highest respect for him—but he might, if he desired to do so, begin certifying that the United States had no claim to areas seaward of the 3-mile or 3-league limit. He would have blanket authority to decide that certain areas were within navigable waters, and hence owned by the States. He might in that way dispose of Federal property.

I am certain that Texas and Louisiana will be better protected if such a determination is reached in the courts, and is not arrived at by an executive official.

Although that determination might not be made, yet it seems to me it could be made. Therefore, I believe a provision such as this one in a measure respecting the outer shelf is a bad one.

Mr. LONG. Do I correctly understand that in the case of a bay or a sound, if a Federal official contended that the inland waters began at one place, and, hence, that the Continental Shelf began some miles beyond that point, the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico would make it unlawful for the Secretary of the Interior or the Attorney General to agree among themselves about where the coastline would be and, therefore, where the outer Continental Shelf would begin?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; just the reverse.

The next subsection provides that if there is a controversy between the United States and a State, it may be settled by agreement. The original provision would leave out the State, entirely.

It was my feeling that it would be safer to require an agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and the State, rather than to permit the Secre-

tary of the Interior by himself to make the certification.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CORDON. I know the Senator from New Mexico wishes to be exact in citing the provisions of the bill. The provision we are discussing would also permit of a decision upon the application of a lessor. A State could also petition for a certification by the Secretary under the present language.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would this language apply only to existing leases previously granted by the States?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it will apply to areas outside the historic boundaries of the States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that; but it would apply to the existing leases that have been granted by the States, would it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it will apply all the way through.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then it would apply to leases now existing and to those to be granted in the future.

Would not this provision, as written, give the Secretary of the Interior authority to fix the boundaries or limits seaward from the shoreline of a State?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not say it would.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, it would give him such authority.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it could or might. But I thought it would be much better if the measure guarantees that States have a voice in the matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am in agreement with the Senator from New Mexico, and I hope the language will be stricken.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. As I understand, if this particular subsection is stricken, there would be nothing to prevent the Attorney General of the United States or the Secretary of the Interior, in the performance of the normal duties of their particular offices; from making a decision as to whether the area covered by a lease is within the outer Continental Shelf or is within the historic State boundaries. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. If he were to deal with an area which would be regarded as controversial, I think he would have to deal with the State before he could proceed. Nothing in this amendment would jeopardize the operations of the Secretary of the Interior or the rights of a State, because of the elimination of this subsection.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand that all the Senator from New Mexico has in mind is to remove the provision for an official certification procedure.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. Provision for that procedure was included in the O'Mahoney-Anderson measure last year and in my bill this year in order to cover a particular area of

California, previously covered by a stipulation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, in line 10, after the word "such", and before the word "regulations", it is proposed to insert "rules and."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the amendment is continued on the second page of the printed amendments, and I ask to have that part of the amendment stated in connection with the other part.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The second part of the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, in line 11, it is proposed to strike out "under section 5 of this Act" and to insert "from time to time"; and to strike out the words "within ninety"; and in line 12, to strike out the word "days."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have had further opportunity to discuss this matter with the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. I believe he feels that the original language is preferable. The junior Senator from Washington and I were trying to make sure only that the Secretary of the Interior was not limited to 90 days in his ability to promulgate rules for this area.

After consultation with the Senator from Oregon, if he can state for the legislative record his understanding of that section, and perhaps can discuss it with the Senator from Washington, who had originally suggested this language, I think we could clear up the matter in that way, rather than to have the amendment adopted.

I yield now to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, it must first be kept in mind that the language appearing on page 18 has to do with the conditions precedent to a decision by the Secretary of the Interior to permit continuance or maintenance of a lease which had been granted by one of the abutting States. In connection with the provisions—and there are a number of them; some 11 or more—regarding the conditions precedent, it was deemed that the Secretary of the Interior should have the power, when a lease meets these conditions, to amend the terms of the lease itself, in order to make the provisions of the federally-validated leases conform to Federal leases issued under the general Mineral Leasing Act. That is, he could provide additional regulations, and amend existing terms, in the State-issued lease, but only during a 3-month period from the time such a lease qualified for Federal validation.

We must keep in mind that a lease granted by a State is subject to the laws and regulations of the State, but it may not include all the pertinent and necessary provisions which would be required to be included under the provisions of this act.

So the language which was proposed to be stricken provides that the lease may be validated or maintained under the provisions of the lease itself or as authorized by the lease and by "such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may under section 5 of this act prescribe within 90 days after making his determination that such lease meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section."

The regulations referred to there are the ones the Secretary of the Interior may find it necessary to establish as conditions precedent to the modification of the lease which is to be validated by the Federal Government and maintained under this act. The provision and language does not refer to the rules and regulations "in order to provide for the prevention of waste and conservation of the natural resources of the outer Continental Shelf, and the protection of correlative rights therein," and so forth, as that provision is set forth in section 5 on page 10, where we find the following committee amendment:

The Secretary shall administer the provisions of this act relating to the leasing of the outer Continental Shelf, and shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out such provisions. The Secretary may at any time prescribe and amend such rules and regulations as he determines to be necessary and proper in order to provide for the prevention of waste and conservation of the natural resources of the outer Continental Shelf, and the protection of correlative rights therein—

I call particular attention to the following words—

and, notwithstanding any other provisions herein, such rules and regulations shall apply to all operations conducted under a lease issued or maintained under the provisions of this act.

That was the provision which I am sure the Senator was fearful might in some way be amended by the language in question in section 6 (b). I am satisfied that, after careful consideration, he is in agreement with the Senator from Oregon that such is not the case.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Washington for the purpose of addressing a question to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I may state to the senior Senator from Oregon that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I worked out the amendment now being considered, and the Senator from New Mexico offered the amendment for both of us.

Mr. CORDON. I understood that.

Mr. JACKSON. The amendment was offered because it was felt that the language presently contained in the bill, starting in line 10 on page 18, might unintentionally restrict the Secretary of the Interior to a specified period of 90 days in his issuance and amendment of general rules and regulations to prevent waste, conserve resources, and protect

correlative rights, as applied to these State-initiated leases.

It is my understanding, in view of what has taken place here in the colloquy on the floor, that the 90-day limitation clearly does not take effect until the Secretary determines that the other conditions precedent have been complied with and the Secretary, in effect, is ready to have the lease validated, and to bring it under Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. I also understand that the Secretary of the Interior has within his own discretion the power to fix the time when the determination of compliance with the statutory requirements is made. And thereafter he has 90 days to prescribe regulations affecting the terms of such leases. So he can in effect fix the time when such leases may be maintained under Federal authority.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. But as a practical matter, I take it, that regulations which would in effect bring about amendments to the prior written instrument, referring now to the lease previously granted by one of the States, would probably be made contemporaneously with the determination that the requirements of this law have been met.

Mr. CORDON. As a practical proposition, I am reasonably sure they would be; it would be necessary that a determination be made as to exactly what the rights of the lessee and the new lessor, that is, the Federal Government, were, perhaps, before the holder of the lease would be prepared to expend more money.

Mr. JACKSON. And, as the senior Senator from Oregon has pointed out, the general rules and regulations referred to in section 5 on page 10 of the bill which relate to the prevention of waste, the conservation of natural resources and the protection of correlative rights, could be promulgated and amended either in connection with the validation of the State leases, or at any other time.

Mr. CORDON. Yes; they could be amended at any time.

Mr. JACKSON. They could be amended at any time and are in no way subject to the 90-day limitation in section 6 (b). In other words, there is no attempt by clause (2) of subsection (b) found on page 18, line 10, to treat the State-originated leases in any different manner and in a different way from that in which the new leases which are authorized by this legislation and which would be issued subsequent to the enactment of this legislation, would be treated. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is entirely correct, and that is precisely spelled out.

Mr. JACKSON. In other words, all leases in this area are to be treated the same, for all purposes, within the law and are subject to the same powers of the Secretary to prescribe and amend rules and regulations at any time under section 5. The leases that have been issued already by the States and the new Federal leases to be issued later, which the Secretary would have authority to issue

under the pending bill, would all be treated on the same basis.

Mr. CORDON. Precisely so.

Mr. JACKSON. In view of the colloquy which has taken place, and the legislative history which has been made by the colloquy on the floor of the Senate, I see no need for this amendment, and I assume that the junior Senator from New Mexico will withdraw it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in view of the excellent explanation we have had by the senior Senator from Oregon, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished majority leader for the purpose of propounding a unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and the Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, after consultation with Senators on both sides of the aisle, I should like to propose a unanimous consent request. Prior to stating the request, I may say that if the agreement can be made the acting majority leader plans to move to recess the Senate until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The unanimous consent request is that on any amendment each Senator may have 20 minutes; that on the bill itself there be 3 hours of debate, the time to be equally divided, and to be controlled on one side by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and the other side by the minority leader, and to be allocated according to the requests that may be made; and that all amendments be germane. That is the substance of the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from California is asking that each Senator be permitted to speak as long as 20 minutes on each amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Not to exceed 20 minutes on each amendment.

Mr. LONG. Then, if four Senators should desire to discuss an amendment, they could conceivably talk for an hour and 20 minutes, under the agreement. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. They could conceivably do so, if they wanted to do it.

Mr. LONG. I have no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it contemplated that there will be any rollcalls this evening?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the unanimous-consent agreement is made, there will not be. If there are any more technical amendments to be offered, I would hope that we might get them out of the way this evening.

Mr. JACKSON. But any amendment requiring the call of the roll will go over until tomorrow, I understand.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; any amendment requiring a rollcall.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am anxious to agree with the acting major-

ity leader. I hope that, after his unanimous-consent request is agreed to, he will allow me to finish with the technical amendments, two in number, to which there can be no possible objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is what I had in mind, that the Senate would remain in session until action was taken on technical amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request proposed by the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for one additional request?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business this evening, it take a recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me for the purpose of submitting an amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from South Dakota for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in order that it may be printed, I submit an amendment which is identical with the text of the amendment which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] read earlier today, and which was accepted in connection with the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and myself. It should appear as a new section on the last page of the bill, immediately prior to the section relating to appropriations. I submit the amendment so that it may be printed for the information of Members of the Senate, and be called up tomorrow.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield, so that I may ask the Senator from South Dakota a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the privilege of joining with the distinguished Senator from

South Dakota as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion, and I should have included the request that the amendment be received as an amendment on behalf of myself and the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have one minor amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "(i)" and insert "(j)."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is another amendment, on page 15, line 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 2, after the word "that" it is proposed to insert the word "it."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, one of the sections of the bill provides for exploiting and developing the Continental Shelf in the field of production of sulfur. The bill provides:

In order to meet the urgent need for further exploration and development of the oil and gas deposits of the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, the Secretary is authorized to grant to the highest responsible qualified bidder by competitive bidding—

And so forth. That states the objective. During emergencies such as we have had in the past, it has been very difficult for agriculture and other lines of activity to obtain sufficient sulfur to take care of the need. Particularly, the fruit growers were unable to get a sufficient quantity of sulfur to use in the combination of lime and sulfur for spraying purposes. In my State we had such difficulty in both world wars, and it has occurred in recent times also.

My State is interested in seeing to it that there is an ample production of sulfur. I am glad the measure contains a provision with respect to sulfur leasing. I am, however, very apprehensive over the figure which has been set, a 10 percent royalty to be exacted from producers or lessees in this particular field of activity. I feel that the subject should be given considerable study.

Evidence has come to my attention that one of the things on which we were relying in the committee was the so-called minimum requirement in the States of Louisiana and Texas with respect to sulfur leases. I have found that what we were informed was the actual fact is rather inaccurate. In other words, the material was not up to date.

In that connection, Mr. President, I have before me two affidavits, one signed by C. J. Bonnacarrere, secretary of the State mineral board of the State of Louisiana, and the other by Bascom Giles, commissioner of the General Land Office of the State of Texas. I shall not offer an amendment to change the limit, but I ask unanimous consent to have these two affidavits printed in the RECORD as a part of my statement.

There being no objection, the affidavits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF LOUISIANA:

Parish of East Baton Rouge:

Before me, the undersigned authority personally came and appeared, C. J. Bonnacarrere of the full age of majority and a resident of the Parish of East Baton Rouge, who being by me duly sworn did depose and say:

That he is the secretary of the State Mineral Board of the State of Louisiana, that he has been connected with said Board since 1940, and that in his present capacity he receives bids submitted to the State mineral board in response to application for bids for mineral leases by the State of Louisiana covering public lands, and that he keeps the minutes of the State mineral board covering all transactions of said board including the official records of all leases awarded by the State mineral board.

That all mineral leases covering State owned land or water bottoms and/or public lands are executed by the State mineral board on behalf of the State of Louisiana and cover and affect the exploration for and production of oil, gas, sulfur, potash, and other gaseous or liquid hydrocarbons; and that to the best of his knowledge and belief, since he has been connected with the State mineral board, no mineral lease has ever been granted by the State of Louisiana covering sulfur alone.

That 1,926 mineral leases have been executed by the State mineral board from October 22, 1938, to June 10, 1953, covering State-owned land or water bottoms and/or public lands; that the sulfur royalty provided in each of these leases has varied, but the royalty on sulfur can be summarized as follows:

1. Seven hundred and ninety-eight leases (or 41.48 percent) provided for a royalty of \$0.75 per long ton of sulfur produced and sold.
2. Three leases (or 0.16 percent) provided for a royalty of \$0.80 per long ton of sulfur produced and sold.
3. One lease (or 0.05 percent) provided for a royalty of \$0.85 per long ton of sulfur produced and sold.
4. One lease (or 0.05 percent) provided for a royalty of \$0.95 per long ton of sulfur produced and sold.
5. Four hundred and sixty-four leases (or 24.09 percent) provided for a royalty of \$1 per long ton of sulfur produced and sold.
6. Three leases (or 0.16 percent) provided for a royalty of \$1.10 per long ton of sulfur produced and sold.
7. One lease (or 0.05 percent) provided for a royalty of \$1.15 per long ton of sulfur produced and sold.
8. Two leases (or 0.10 percent) provided for a royalty of \$1.25 per long ton of sulfur produced and sold.
9. One lease (or 0.05 percent) provided for a royalty of \$1.40 per long ton of sulfur produced and sold.
10. One hundred and forty-nine leases (or 7.74 percent) provided for a royalty of \$1.50 per long ton of sulfur produced and sold.
11. Five leases (or 0.26 percent) provided for a royalty of \$1.75 per long ton of sulfur produced and sold.
12. Four hundred and sixty-seven leases (or 24.20 percent) provided for a royalty of \$2 per long ton of sulfur produced and sold.
13. Eighteen leases (or 0.93 percent) provided for a royalty of \$2.50 per long ton of sulfur produced and sold.
14. Three leases (or 0.16 percent) provided for a royalty of \$3 per long ton of sulfur produced and sold.
15. One lease (or 0.05 percent) provided for a royalty of \$4.25 per long ton of sulfur produced and sold.
16. Nine leases (or 0.47 percent) were court orders or unitization agreements, in which royalties were not a factor.

That there has been sulfur production in the State of Louisiana under only three State leases, none of which cover water bottoms in the Gulf of Mexico, to wit:

State lease No. 124 and dated August 26, 1924, and covering the bed of Lake Peigneur from which sulfur was produced and royalty was paid to the State of Louisiana from 1932 to 1936 at the rate of 75 cents per long ton produced and sold.

State lease No. 199, dated March 26, 1928, and covering, among other lands and water bottoms, the bed of Bay St. Elaine from which sulfur has been and is presently being produced with royalty payments to the State of Louisiana since November 1952 at the rate of 75 cents per long ton produced and sold.

State lease No. 212, dated July 18, 1928, and covering the bed of Lake Grand Ecaille from which sulfur has been and is presently being produced with royalty payments to the State of Louisiana since 1934 at the rate of 75 cents per long ton produced and sold.

That it is expected that sulfur production will result from operations now being conducted under State lease No. 214, dated September 13, 1928, and covering, among other land and water bottoms, Garden Island Bay. When sulfur is produced under said lease, royalty will be paid to the State of Louisiana at the rate of 75 cents per long ton produced and sold.

That Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950 (title 30, sec. 127) prescribes the minimum royalty on sulfur to be 75 cents per long ton produced and sold, but that by resolution of the members of the then existing State mineral board dated August 29, 1951 (and reaffirmed by the present mineral board), the State mineral board indicated to all interested parties leasing State-owned lands that they favor a royalty on sulfur of not less than \$2 per long ton.

That, as a consequence of the mineral board resolution, most recent applicants for mineral leases have incorporated in their bids a royalty on sulfur of \$2 per ton, but it should be noted that almost all of the successful bidders for State mineral leases were individuals or corporations who were primarily engaged in exploration for oil and gas.

That, in considering competing bids for mineral leases, the members of the State mineral board consider both the amount of the cash bonus and the royalty offered the State of Louisiana, and after consultation with the State geologist and after carefully weighing all factors, the State mineral board awards the lease to the bidder whose bid they believe to be the most favorable to the State of Louisiana.

That, in an effort to make their bids as competitive as possible, individuals or corporations which are primarily interested in oil and gas production, may offer royalty on sulfur substantially in excess of that which would make exploration for, and production of, sulfur commercially feasible, and that thus, the sulfur royalty provided in recent leases may have no bearing on the royalty which, at present sulfur prices, would encourage exploration for, and production of, sulfur, particularly from the Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico.

That practically all State mineral leases covering water bottoms owned or claimed by the State of Louisiana and located on the Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico, were issued by the State of Louisiana between the years 1945 and 1949, and most of these leases provide for a royalty on sulfur of less than \$2 per long ton produced and sold.

That no sulfur has been produced under a State lease covering State-owned water bottoms on the Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico.

That the State mineral board in granting mineral leases covering State-owned water

bottoms on the Continental Shelf has taken into consideration the immense difficulty in conducting exploratory and development operations on the Continental Shelf and consequently has accepted bids carrying in some cases a lesser royalty than would be expected from leases covering dry land and/or more accessible and protected water bottoms.

Further the deponent sayeth not.

C. J. BONNECARRERE.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 17th day of June 1953.

Mrs. ROSEMARY TORBET BROUSSARD,
Notary Public in and for the
Parish of East Baton Rouge.

STATE OF TEXAS:

County of Travis:

Before me, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared Bascom Giles, a credible person, who, after being by me duly sworn, on oath deposes and says:

I am, and for many years have been, commissioner of the general land office of the State of Texas.

Numerous leases were granted by the State of Texas on State owned lands in the Gulf of Mexico during the period 1931 to 1947, all of which covered not only oil and gas but also sulfur and other nonmetallic minerals, in accordance with the leasing statutes in force during such period. Practically all of these leases have expired, only 8 being still in force by reason of oil or gas operations or extensions or suspensions as provided by existing statutes; but there has never been any sulfur royalty paid to the State of Texas under the terms of any of such mineral leases.

In 1947 the State legislature passed a law amending the prior statutes insofar as they pertained to the granting of leases on State owned lands in the Gulf of Mexico covering oil, gas, sulfur and all other nonmetallic minerals in the same lease, and providing for the granting of leases on such lands for oil and gas only and for the separate leasing of such lands for other nonmetallic minerals, including sulfur.

Since the passage of the 1947 statute providing for the separate leasing of State-owned lands in the Gulf of Mexico for sulfur, no such lease has been granted by the State; nor has the State at any time ever granted a lease covering sulfur only in lands in the Gulf of Mexico.

Under the Texas laws, the royalty on sulfur under any mineral leases covering sulfur granted on State-owned lands in the Gulf of Mexico is one-eighth of the gross production of sulfur or the value thereof.

There have been many leases granted by the State of Texas covering oil, gas, and certain other minerals, including sulfur, on State-owned lands other than lands in the Gulf of Mexico which leases provide for a one-eighth royalty on sulfur; however, there has never been any sulfur royalty paid to the State of Texas under the terms of any such mineral leases.

As of this date, according to the records in the office of the commissioner of the General Land Office of the State of Texas, there are now in force approximately 198 of the leases covering oil, gas, and certain other minerals, including sulfur, previously granted on State-owned lands other than lands in the Gulf of Mexico.

The records of the office of the commissioner of the General Land Office of the State of Texas do not reflect that any attempt has ever been made to produce sulfur from any of the lands covered by such leases, neither do such records reflect the nature of any such attempt; nor do I have any knowledge of any attempt ever having been made by any lessee to produce sulfur from any of the lands covered by any of such leases.

Many mineral awards (mining claims) have been granted on lands sold by the State

with the reservation of all minerals thereunder, and many of such mineral awards have been subsequently patented under the terms of presently existing statutes. Many of these awards are still in force, and a great many more have been patented, all of which are subject to the royalty reserved by the State. Such awards granted since 1935 (and patents issued thereon) reserved to the State of Texas a royalty of 6 1/4 percent on all minerals covered thereby, including sulfur produced from such lands. So far as the records of this office show, no royalties have been paid to the State of Texas on account of production of sulfur from these lands within the past 20 years, although prior to that period the State may have received some small royalty payments from this source.

Furthermore, according to information from the records of gross-receipts taxes in the office of the comptroller of the State of Texas, payment of such taxes has been made on sulfur produced in the State, but the State has made no mineral awards, mineral award patents, or leases in the areas covered by these reports.

BASCOM GILES.

Sworn to and subscribed by Bascom Giles before me this 17th day of June 1953.

REVA S. JACKSON,
Notary Public in and for Travis
County, Tex.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if there be no further business to be transacted, I move that, pursuant to the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate now take a recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, June 25, 1953, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, June 24 (legislative day of June 8), 1953:

UNITED NATIONS

Irving Salomon, of California, to be a representative of the United States of America to the second extraordinary session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Mrs. Elizabeth E. Heffelfinger, of Minnesota, to be the alternate representative of the United States of America to the second extraordinary session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The following-named persons to be members of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department:

Consuelo Northrop Bailey, of Vermont.
Richard Berlin, of New York.
John Coleman, of Michigan.
Richard J. Gray, of Ohio.
Rowland Jones, Jr., of South Dakota.
Curtis McGraw, of New Jersey.
Charles White, of Ohio.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Lewis L. Strauss, of Brandy Station, Va., to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1958, vice Gordon Dean, term expiring.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Charles W. Atkinson, of Arkansas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Arkansas.

Harry Richards, of Missouri, to be a United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri, vice George L. Robertson, resigned.

John C. Crawford, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee.

Millsaps Fitzhugh, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the western district of Tennessee, vice John Brown, term expired.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

James L. May, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Alabama, vice Vernon P. Burns, term expired.

Frank O. Bell, of California, to be United States marshal for the northern district of California, vice John A. Roseen, resigning.

Thomas J. Lunney, of New York, to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York.

Roy A. Harmon, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the western district of North Carolina, vice Jacob C. Bowman, term expired.

Harold Sexton, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon.

Howard S. Proctor, of Rhode Island, to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be major

CHAPLAIN

(X) Willis, Charles Francis, 18796A.

To be captains

AIR FORCE

Jackson, Stuart Lee, 17078A.

(X) Larkin, Harold Joseph, 17078A.

(X) Stukas, Robert Russel, 17169A.

Thomas, Rex O., 17293A.

Lamp, Richard Earl, 17416A.

(X) Butler, Jerome Frederick, 17497A.

Mason, William Henderson, 17508A.

White, Charles Reuben, 17533A.

Howell, Philip Vann, Jr., 17534A.

Sanders, Stephen John, 17535A.

Schweizer, George J., Jr., 20038A.

Davis, Homer Sims, 17536A.

Turner, Joseph Harry, 17537A.

Krieger, Thomas Bert, 17538A.

(X) Adams, Harry Jones, 17539A.

Peebles, Thomas Nathaniel, 17540A.

Steorts, Ward Arnold, 17541A.

Harmon, William Alexander, 21438A.

Dillard, George Edward, 17542A.

(X) Reiss, Leonard, 21439A.

Ricketts, James Ellsworth, Jr., 17543A.

Vidmer, Richards, Jr., 17544A.

Garlington, Arthur Roe, Jr., 17545A.

(X) Boehm, Paul Francis, 17546A.

Hartzell, Richard Atley, 17547A.

Like, Delbert Odell, 17548A.

Latshaw, Robert Thomas, Jr., 17549A.

Hudlow, Richard Jolly, 17550A.

Arave, William Lloyd, 17551A.

(X) Scruton, Albert Marshall, 21786A.

(X) Yeager, Randall Gerald, Jr., 17552A.

(X) Gaines, Edmund Pendleton, Jr., 17558A.

Everette, John Bernard, 17559A.

Harris, Roy Lee, Jr., 17560A.

Sadler, Robert Edward, 17561A.



Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, June 8, 1953)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Hirl A. Kester, minister, Waugh Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in ages past, our hope in days to come, our ever-present help in the time of trouble, we come to Thee because Thou art good, and Thy mercy endureth forever. We come because we recognize that every good, true, and perfect gift cometh from above. We come because we know that Thou hast made us a great Nation, and not we ourselves.

We pray that Thou wilt give us strength, courage, and faith to keep us a great Nation.

We pray that Thou wilt bless the Senate this day. May everything Senators say and do be for Thy name's honor and glory. We pray that Thou wilt bless our President and all who are in places of authority throughout our great country.

May this be a day marked by the presence of Thy Holy Spirit.

These favors we ask in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 24, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3203) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them in the furnishing of transportation of property, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 92), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

Whereas the year 1953 is the 50th anniversary year of the first successful controlled powered flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright in a heavier-than-air craft at Kitty Hawk, N. C., on December 17, 1903; and

Whereas in the 50 years which have passed since that great event the women of America have made substantial contribution to the development of aviation; and

Whereas the women of America now are assuming an increasingly important role in the field of aviation; and

Whereas the many opportunities which exist for women in the field of aviation are constantly increasing; and

Whereas the organization of women pilots, generally known as the Ninety-Nines, Inc., symbolizes the participation of women in the development of aviation; and

Whereas in tribute to the accomplishment of Wilbur and Orville Wright and to the swift progress which has been made in the field of aviation in the past 50 years, such organization has sponsored a transcontinental air race on July 3, 1953, from Lawrence, Mass., to Long Beach, Calif., in which more than 50 women pilots will participate; and

Whereas such transcontinental air race is the first east-west flight competition by resourceful and courageous women who are following the great tradition of Amelia Earhart; and

Whereas such transcontinental air race in the year of the 50th anniversary of the first successful controlled powered flight symbolizes the important role of women in the field of aviation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in this 50th anniversary year of the first successful controlled powered flight in heavier-than-air craft by Wilbur and Orville Wright, at Kitty Hawk, N. C., on December 17, 1903, the Congress hereby—

(1) expresses its high esteem of and great regard for the important part played by women in the development of aviation in the past 50 years;

(2) expresses the hope that women will continue to take an increasingly important part in the field of aviation in the future; and

(3) extends its best wishes for the success of the first east-west transcontinental air race on July 3, 1953, from Lawrence, Mass., to Long Beach, Calif., under the sponsorship of the organization of women pilots generally known as the Ninety-Nines, Inc., in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first successful controlled powered flight in heavier-than-air craft.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore.

H. R. 2313. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of March 27, 1942, as extended, relating to the inspection and audit of plants, books, and records of defense contractors, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter;

H. R. 2557. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in

effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; and

H. R. 4126. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits, until July 1, 1954.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. WATKINS, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this week during sessions of the Senate.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is the proposal of the acting majority leader that there not be a morning hour today until the Senate has completed action on the submerged lands bill.

I ask unanimous consent that following final action on the bill, there be the usual morning hour, for the purpose of permitting Senators to introduce bills and joint resolutions and to make insertions in the RECORD, and transact other routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into last evening, each side is allotted

1½ hours on the bill. My inquiry is whether it is in order to yield any of that 1½ hours prior to action on a pending amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Texas restate the last part of his question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it in order to yield any of the time allocated to each side for discussion of the bill, prior to action on a pending amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. So far as the Chair is aware, under the unanimous-consent agreement there would be no objection to doing that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6-23-53," and ask that it be stated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I call up my amendments designated "6-23-53-C."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 30, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

Sec. 15, Report by Secretary: As soon as practicable after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report detailing the amounts of all moneys received and expended in connection with the administration of this act during the preceding fiscal year.

On page 30, line 7, it is proposed to change "15" to "16."

On page 30, line 10, it is proposed to change "16" to "17."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the purpose of these amendments is to cause the Secretary to report to the Congress each year the amount of money that is being realized from operations on the Continental Shelf. It seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that the Congress is entitled to know just how much money is involved in this operation. There have been wide discrepancies in the estimates, as between those of us who say that there may be a few million dollars of revenue initially, and that the greatest amount to be generated is perhaps \$40 million or \$50 million a year, while on the other hand there are those who say that \$300 billion would be realized from the resources in this area. I believe it would be well for the Congress to know, year by year, the amount of money actually being realized from operations on the Continental Shelf. If the House should refuse to agree to the

Senate amendment which would provide that the money shall be split up among the various States for education, the Congress would not know that a certain amount of revenue was being produced.

Mr. President, I believe there should be no objection to these amendments. I hope the distinguished acting chairman of the committee [Mr. CORDON] is willing to take the amendments to conference. I see no reason why they should not be agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, had these amendments been offered in committee I am sure they would have been agreed to. I think they present a sound approach to the overall problem. In my opinion, the amendments would be in the interest of further enlightenment of Congress with respect to the resources of the seabed and subsoil of the outer Continental Shelf. I have no objection to the amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask my good friend, the minority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas], for some time on the bill before I present my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Louisiana 45 minutes at this time, and will yield more time later if he needs it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader yields 45 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, before presenting my amendment, I desire to discuss the bill to some extent, particularly with reference to previous acquisition of lands by the United States—how those lands were acquired, and how they were thereafter disposed of.

There are four methods by which land was formerly acquired by the Government—first, by cession; second, by purchase; third, by conquest; and, fourth, by annexation, as in the case of Texas.

Mr. President, I should like to place in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks, a summary of the various methods whereby our Nation has acquired territory in the past. This summary is contained in Hibbard's *A History of the Public Land Policies*, at page 28. The summary shows how we have acquired lands in the past, where, the prices paid, and the disposition made of them.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SUMMARY

The idea of a public domain was firmly fixed in the minds of the colonists, particularly those living in colonies with a claim to extensive territory. This sense of proprietorship over unoccupied land very promptly extended to the Confederacy, even antedating any tangible claim to the backlands. A controversy between the colonies and the new National Government regarding jurisdiction was inevitable. The colonies having claims to western land, no matter how flimsy the claim, were not disposed to give them up without something in the semblance of compensation. The principle on which the dispute was settled was at least clear, even though not altogether logical; the western land was obtained by common sacrifices, hence should be common property. Such a

principle might have been applied so as to have cut down the claim to a great deal of unsettled land within the boundaries of the new States as they were later established. Just what were the logical territorial limits of such States as Virginia and Georgia there was no way of saying. Maryland claimed a share in the western lands, but just what western lands were nobody knew. Like many other disputes a settlement was more important than the basis on which it was made. The States, even before they were properly called States, in order to form the confederation, beginning with New York, 1781, and ending with Georgia, 13 years after the adoption of the Constitution, ceded their western claims. Thus was formed a great public domain.

In 1803 by the purchase of Louisiana almost a third of the present area of the United States was added. The payment was \$15 million plus enough more eventually to make \$27 million. Florida in 1819 with 72,000 square miles, cost \$5 million plus another million and a half. Texas, annexed in 1845, added 389,000 square miles. Oregon, with 287,000 square miles, though at one time believed to be a part of the Louisiana Purchase, was acquired by treaty in 1846. By conquest, California, in 1848, with a half a million square miles, was added. The Gadsden Purchase added a mere trifle, about the size of South Carolina, in 1853. This completes the acquisitions, outside of Alaska, of continental territory. From the gross amount of land ceded to, or purchased by, the United States must be subtracted 34,600,000 acres of private claims. The total extent of public domain acquired by the Government was approximately 1,400,000,000 acres of land. The cost in money payment, including interest, was \$59,753,000, or about 4¼ cents an acre.

Mr. ELLENDER. Today we find ourselves in an entirely new field, insofar as the acquisition of property is concerned. Various theories are advanced as to why and how we have obtained the lands comprising the outer Continental Shelf, lying in that area of the coastal waters located beyond the historical seaward boundaries of the coastal States.

At this time I should like to present to the Senate a summary, consisting of a portion of a decision printed in the *International Comparative Law Quarterly*, in a case entitled "In the Matter of an Arbitration Between Petroleum Development (Trucial Coast) Ltd., and the Sheikh of Abu Dhabi," and which appears in the Senate Interior Committee's hearings on the pending bill, showing how and under what theory this land is being claimed by the Federal Government. As the hearings will show, there is some conflict of view, as to whether title to this land was acquired by accretion, or was acquired because it is contiguous to our Nation's shores. Other theories are advanced in the summary, which I ask to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

(d) The doctrine of the Continental Shelf, its substance and history: The expression "Continental Shelf" was first used by a geographer in 1898. The legal doctrine which later gathered round this geographical term was possibly foreshadowed when in 1942 England and Venezuela concluded a treaty about the Gulf of Paria providing for spheres of influence in respect of areas covered by the high seas and followed by certain annexations coincident with these spheres.

The doctrine was perhaps first explicitly asserted as a legal doctrine (in a very exaggerated form) in a proclamation by the Argentine Republic in 1944, but its classical enunciation in the form in which it has mainly to be considered in this case was the well-known proclamation by President Truman of September 28, 1945.

The substance of the doctrine then proclaimed, as I understand it, was this: A coastal power is not surrounded, even at low water, by a precipice leading vertically to the bottom of the ocean, perhaps 2 miles below. As a rule the seabed shelves very gently outward and downward for a considerable distance, a distance generally (but not invariably) exceeding the 3-mile territorial limit. Again, not always but very often, where the sea reaches a depth of about 100 fathoms or (what is much the same thing) 200 meters, the edge of this shelf is reached and there is a more or less abrupt plunge of the land mass down to the ocean floor. The doctrine of the "shelf" as proclaimed in the Truman Declaration of 1945 arrogated to the United States jurisdiction and control over the resources of the American Continental Shelf which was described as appertaining to the United States.

The resources referred to were those of the subsoil of that zone of the seabed which lies between the limit of the territorial waters and the point at which its gently shelving character gives place to an abrupt descent.

Several other states followed roughly on the same course as the United States. For instance, Great Britain (not quite on the same lines) in respect of Jamaica and of the Bahamas, and Saudi Arabia in respect of parts of the Persian Gulf. Other states weighed in with similar claims. These other states fall into two groups: I, Mexico and the Latin and Central American Republic; and II, the states which are most directly relevant in this arbitration, states bordering on the Persian Gulf other than Saudi Arabia.

In almost every case the claim was embodied in a decree or proclamation. Most often, though not invariably, the proclamation was in a declaratory form, that is in a form asserting or implying that the proclamation was not constitutive of a new right but merely recorded in the existence of a preexisting one.

I. The claims of the Latin and Central American Republics were often far more ambitious than those of this country, the United States and Saudi Arabia; inasmuch as on the one hand the former claims were often claims to actual sovereignty over the shelf and its subsoil and on the other hand, and this is more important, the claims were often not limited to the shelf as a geological entity or even to the area ending where the depth of the sea began to exceed 100 fathoms, but sometimes extended to a zone 200 nautical miles from the mainland; an area quite unrelated to the width of the physical shelf. In these exorbitant forms the claims met with protest and resistance; but in the more modest form in which they were advanced by the United States, the United Kingdom, and Saudi Arabia, they were acquiesced in by the generality of powers, or at least not actively gainsaid by them.

II. The British-Persian Gulf proclamations: The proclamation of Saudi Arabia was followed in 1949 by proclamations issued by the Sheikhs of the crucial states (or on their behalf by the Government of the United Kingdom qua protecting power), including the Sheikhs of Abu Dhabi. All of these last proclamations conform broadly in their terms to the Truman proclamation. They mostly contain recitals on the following lines: "Whereas it is just that the seabed and subsoil extending to a reasonable distance from the coast should appertain to and be controlled by the littoral State to which it is adjacent." The Abu Dhabi proclamation of June 10, 1949, provides in its operative part "We, Shakhbut Bin Sultan

Bin Za'id, Ruler of Abu Dhabi, hereby declare that the seabed and subsoil lying beneath the high seas in the Persian Gulf contiguous to the territorial waters of Abu Dhabi and extending seaward to boundaries to be determined more precisely as occasion arises on equitable principles by us after consultation with the neighboring states appertain to the land of Abu Dhabi and are subject to its exclusive jurisdiction and control."

(e) Is the doctrine in any of its forms part and parcel of international law? The preceding section calls attention not only to the recent origin of the doctrine but to the great variety of forms which in its short life it has assumed. Some states claim sovereignty over the shelf. Others pointedly avoid doing so, claiming only "jurisdiction" or "control," "appurtenance," and the like. Whatever the scope of the rights claimed, some states assert those rights by declaratory proclamations implying their preexistence; others issue proclamations which are on the face of them a new departure and designed to be constitutive of title. What is the seaward limit of the shelf? Here again the answers given differ. Some states say, "its geological or geographical limit, its edge, or its crop." Others (whether because their particular shelf has got no edge and has got no drop, or for other reasons), say, "the point at which the sea becomes 100 fathoms or 200 meters deep"; while yet others say, "a line drawn parallel to the coast of the contiguous power and 200 nautical miles from it." The 200-mile claim seems to be more or less universally discredited. The other two criteria seem on their face much more reasonable. But what is the position where as in the Persian Gulf itself, both of these more reasonable criteria fail us, because the shelf not only has no edge, but extends continuously across a sea whose waters never attain a depth of as much as 100 fathoms? Is it to extend outward to a "reasonable distance" from the coast—the expression used in the recital of the Abu Dhabi proclamation? If so, what is a "reasonable distance"? Where states are grouped, as in this case, round a more or less cylindrical gulf, is the principle *usque ad medium flum* applicable? How could it possibly be applied in the case of comparably shallow seas of completely irregular configuration, such as the North Sea? Again, how are rights of whatever character to the subsoil of the shelf acquired? Can they indeed be acquired at all? Or would their existence inevitably conflict with the freedom of the high seas?

Before the doctrine of the shelf was promulgated, I think the general answer might well have been that they cannot be acquired at all—that the shelf is as inappropriate as the high seas that roll or repose above it; subject to this reservation, that the seabed (not the subsoil) of the submarine area, is in certain rare cases, subject to a customary right vested in certain states to conduct sedentary fisheries in such seabed. For instance, the right to fish for sponges, coral, oysters, pearls, and chank. Indeed, the shallow seas of the Persian Gulf are subject to mutual pearling rights by subjects of the various littoral states. If, however, the submarine area is capable not merely of being the subject matter of these limited occupational rights over the seabed, and pro tanto a *res nullius*, is its subsoil as a whole *res nullius*?

That is to say, something in which right can be acquired, but only by effective occupation? Or is the position as the claimants' main argument maintains, that the rights in the subsoil of the shelf adhere (and must be taken always to have adhered) *ipso jure*—occupation or no occupation—to the contiguous coastal power? Or falling that, if occupation be indeed necessary; in cases where it is almost impracticable, may proclamations, or similar acts be treated as a constructive or symbolic or inchoate occupation

(the claimants' alternative contention under this head)?

Conclusion as to doctrine of the Continental Shelf: Neither the practice of nations nor the pronouncements of learned jurists give any certain or consistent answer to many—perhaps most—of these questions. I am of opinion that there are in this field so many ragged ends and unfilled blanks, so much that is merely tentative and exploratory, that in no form can the doctrine claim as yet to have assumed hitherto the hard lineaments or the definitive status of an established rule of international law.

Whether there ought to exist a rule giving effect to the doctrine in one or other and, if so, which of its forms is another question and one which, if I had to answer it, I should answer in the affirmative. There seems to me much cogency on the arguments of those who advocate the *ipso jure* variant of the doctrine. In particular: (1) it is extremely desirable that someone, in what threatens to become an oil-starved world, should have the right to exploit the subsoil of the submarine area outside the territorial limit; (2) the contiguous coastal power seems the most appropriate and convenient agency for this purpose. It is in the best position to exercise effective control, and the alternatives teem with disadvantages; (3) there is no reason in principle why the subsoil of the high seas should, like the high seas themselves, be incapable of being the subject of exclusive rights in any one. The main reasons why this status is attributed to the high seas is (1) that they are the great highways between nations and navigation of these highways should be unobstructed. (11) That fishing in the high seas should be unrestricted (a policy approved by this country ever since Magna Carta abolished "several" fisheries). The subsoil, however, of the submarine area is not a highway between nations and the installations necessary to exploit it (even though sunk from the surface into the subsoil rather than tunnelled laterally) need hardly constitute an appreciable obstacle to free navigation; nor does the subsoil contain fish. (4) To treat this subsoil as *res nullius*—fair game for the first occupier—entails obvious and grave dangers so far as occupation is possible at all. It invites a perilous scramble. The doctrine that occupation is vital in the case of a *res nullius* has in any case worn thin since the east Greenland arbitration and more especially since that relating to Clipperton Island. But leaving that aside, it is difficult to imagine any arrangement more calculated to produce international friction than one which entitles nation A, it may be thousands of miles from nation B, to stake out claims in the Continental Shelf contiguous to nation B by "squattling" on B's doorstep—at some point just outside nation B's territorial water limit.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to read the last paragraph of the summary:

Whether there ought to exist a rule giving effect to the doctrine in one or other and, if so, which of its forms is another question and one which, if I had to answer it, I should answer in the affirmative.

That relates to the contiguity of these lands to our shores.

There seems to me much cogency on the arguments of those who advocate the *ipso jure* variant of the doctrine. In particular: (1) it is extremely desirable that someone, in what threatens to become an oil-starved world, should have the right to exploit the subsoil of the submarine area outside the territorial limit; (2) the contiguous coastal power seems the most appropriate and convenient agency for this purpose. It is in the best position to exercise effective control, and the alternatives teem with disadvantages; (3) there is no reason in principle

why the subsoil of the high seas should, like the high seas themselves, be incapable of being the subject of exclusive rights in any one. The main reasons why this status is attributed to the high seas is (1) that they are the great highways between nations and navigation of these highways should be unobstructed. (2) That fishing in the high seas should be unrestricted (a policy approved by this country ever since *Magna Carta* abolished several fisheries). The subsoil, however, of the submarine area is not a highway between nations and the installations necessary to exploit it (even though sunk from the surface into the subsoil rather than tunneled laterally) need hardly constitute an appreciable obstacle to free navigation; nor does the subsoil contain fish. (4) To treat this subsoil as *res nullius*—fair game for the first occupier—entails obvious and grave dangers so far as occupation is possible at all. It invites a perilous scramble. The doctrine that occupation is vital in the case of a *res nullius* has in any case worn thin since the east Greenland arbitration and more especially since that relating to Clipperton Island. But leaving that aside, it is difficult to imagine any arrangement more calculated to produce international friction than one which entitles nation A, it may be thousands of miles from nation B, to stake out claims in the Continental Shelf contiguous to nation B by squatting on B's doorstep—at some point just outside nation B's territorial water limit.

In other words, the theory in international law under which we claim this body of land is that it is contiguous to our shoreline.

This theory has been in actual practice for many years, and was used by several of the countries in Europe in order to obtain title and sovereignty to the subsoil of the sea. But in all cases, and as provided in the pending measure, the rights of freedom of the seas which cover these lands have been preserved.

Some nations, however, hold to the theory of first occupancy, and although this is a minority view among members of the United Nations, it has strong support.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the Louisiana case recognized that the use and occupancy on the part of Louisiana of this outer Continental Shelf area may be of great value to our country in the event any question should ever be raised under International Law as to our ownership and right to the subsoil of the Continental Shelf. For that reason alone the rights of the coastal States should be recognized and maintained, and perpetuated, for these rights, these possessory actions, bolster and reinforce the Federal claim to the submerged lands. It strikes me that the dual system of Federal-State sovereignty, which has made our country great, should continue to exist in these offshore areas.

For years, on the coast of Louisiana, fishermen have occupied the coast—have used the waters and piled them with their boats. Many of them have spent virtually all of their lives there. Since 1938 active exploration for oil and gas has been conducted there. We have been in actual possession of the subsoil of the sea located on the Louisiana coast. In 1938, Louisiana extended its boundaries out to 27 miles from its coastline. That fact in time may be Exhibit No. 1 in our claim to national sovereignty over these areas in the

event a dispute involving them should be presented to an international court for arbitration.

I should like to refer at this point to a case which was adjudicated in Europe in 1951—the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case. A digest of the case appears on page 373 of the *Modern Law Review*.

That litigation involved a claim between England and Norway as to the right to fish in the waters located within 4 or 5 miles, as I recall, of the Norwegian coast. The Norwegians claimed exclusive jurisdiction of this area. The case went before the International Court and was decided in Norway's favor because the Norwegians were able to show, and to demonstrate, that their people had been fishing there for centuries and that the fishing grounds were an integral part of the Norwegian economy. Because of those facts, Norway was recognized as having exclusive jurisdiction over these waters.

I should like to read one sentence from the *Law Review* comment on this decision, appearing at page 375 of the *Modern Law Review* for July, 1952:

Nevertheless, the court had no difficulty in holding that Norway had over a long period virtually enjoyed sovereignty over the disputed areas and that the title had been acquiesced in by foreign States.

Mr. President, by the same token we must be able to present evidence of usage and acquiescence in the event any effort is ever made by a foreign government to dispute American title to any of the subsoil beneath our coastal waters. In order to substantiate our claim, and in order to make it more secure in the event such a situation should ever occur, it is my conviction as a lawyer that we should not repudiate the rights of the coastal States in the Continental Shelf area. It seems to me that the coastal States should be permitted to continue an occupancy the right to which has been theirs from time immemorial. We should not place these bodies of land under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government, without preserving the very basis of that Federal claim—the prior possession of the coastal States.

Other theories have been advanced in regard to this question, but it is not my purpose to go into great and lengthy detail with respect to them. I should like at this point to place in the *RECORD*, in order to complete the picture, an excerpt from volume I of Chancellor Kent's *Commentaries on American Law*, published in 1826 with reference to the seaward lines. I quote from Kent's *Commentaries*, at page 38:

Considering the great extent of the line of the American coasts, we have a right to claim, for fiscal and defensive regulations, a liberal extension of maritime jurisdiction; and it would not be unreasonable, as I apprehend, to assume, for domestic purposes connected with our safety and welfare, the control of the waters on our coasts, though included within lines stretching from quite distant headlands, as, for instance, from Cape Ann to Cape Cod, and from Nantucket to Montauk Point, and from that point to the capes of the Delaware, and from the south cape of Florida to the Mississippi. It is certain that our Government would be disposed to view with some uneasiness and sensibility, in the case of war between other maritime powers, the use of the waters of our

coasts, far beyond the reach of cannonshot, as cruising ground for belligerent purposes. In 1793, our Government thought they were entitled, in reason, to as broad a margin of protected navigation as any nation whatever, though at that time they did not positively insist beyond the distance of a marine league from the seashore; (a) and, in 1806, our Government thought it would not be unreasonable, considering the extent of the United States, the shoalness of their coast and the natural indication furnished by the well-defined path of the Gulf Stream, to expect an immunity from belligerent warfare, for the space between that limit and the American shore. It ought, at least, to be insisted that the extent of the neutral immunity should correspond with the claims maintained by Great Britain around her own territory, and that no belligerent right should be exercised within the chambers formed by headlands, or anywhere at sea within the distance of four leagues, or from a right line from one headland to another. (b) In the case of the *Little Belt*, which was cruising many miles from the shore between Cape Henry and Cape Hatteras, our Government laid stress on the circumstance that she was hovering on our coasts; and it was contended on the part of the United States that they had a right to know the national character of armed ships in such a situation, and that it was a right immediately connected with our tranquility and peace. It was further observed, that all nations exercise the right, and none with more rigor or at a greater distance from the coast than Great Britain, and none on more justifiable ground than the United States. (a) There can be but little doubt that, as the United States advance in commerce and naval strength, our Government will be disposed more and more to feel and acknowledge the justice and policy of the British claim to supremacy over the narrow seas adjacent to the British Isles, because we shall stand in need of similar accommodation and means of security.

What I am trying to do, Mr. President, is to outline for the Senate the processes by which our country has acquired additional lands, the precedents for such acquisitions, and to show that the Continental Shelf should be treated in the same manner as any other public land is treated.

I should also like to point out that under our jurisprudence, and under the Constitution itself, it was never intended that our Government should acquire land and should hold it as a colony in perpetuity. The intent of our Founding Fathers was to limit acquisition of land to the ultimate end of making either a State, or a self-governing Territory of it, or incorporating such lands into some existing State.

When Chief Justice Holmes was a member of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, he wrote:

There is no belt of land under the sea adjacent to the coast which is the property of the United States and not the property of the adjacent States.

That quotation appears on page 185 of the hearings.

The same principle was recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States in an opinion written by Chief Justice Taney, in the famous *Dred Scott* decision—19 Howard 393, 446. Mr. President, I should like to read an excerpt from page 446 of that decision:

This brings us to examine by what provision of the Constitution the present Federal Government, under its delegated and

restricted powers, is authorized to acquire territory outside of the original limits of the United States, and what powers it may exercise therein over the person or property of a citizen of the United States, while it remains a Territory, and until it shall be admitted as one of the States of the Union.

There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish or maintain colonies bordering on the United States or at a distance, to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure; nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way, except by the admission of new States. That power is plainly given; and if a new State is admitted, it needs no further legislation by Congress, because the Constitution itself defines the relative rights and powers and duties of the State, and the citizens of the State, and the Federal Government. But no power is given to acquire a territory to be held and governed permanently in that character.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to emphasize one passage from that decision:

There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish or maintain colonies bordering on the United States or at a distance, to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure; nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way, except by the admission of new States . . . no power is given to acquire a territory to be held and governed permanently in that character.

Mr. President, as I understand the pending bill, that is exactly what the Senate would do in this instance. Whether we call this land a territory, or a land mass, or whatnot, it is property of the United States that is to be forever governed from Washington—something which never was intended by the Constitution. From the excerpt I have just read from the famous Dred Scott decision, it is obvious that our Government was never intended to acquire lands, except in the expectation that in the future they would be admitted as a State, administered as a Territory, under the laws governing Territories, or incorporated into existing States.

In this case we are not dealing with a Territory or distant island possessions. Instead, we are dealing with a part of the land mass of the adjacent coastal States. What the Senate committee calls horizontal jurisdiction over the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf is being claimed by the United States under the provisions of the pending bill. Technically, this bill would not extend the boundaries of the United States but would only extend the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the resources and subsoil of the seabed.

Mr. President, some difference of opinion was expressed among the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the question of whether jurisdiction and control, as extended in the bill, were different from sovereignty. In that connection I refer to a colloquy which occurred between the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and Mr. Jack B. Tate, legal adviser of the Department of State. If the testimony which now appears in the committee hearings is read, I believe it will convince anyone that our extension

of jurisdiction and control over the seabed and subsoil of this area really means an extension of sovereignty over the seabed and subsoil.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following testimony which took place during the hearings on S. 1901, held by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, be incorporated into my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony referred to was ordered to be printed, as follows:

Senator DANIEL. I certainly agree with you that it is. And I think it makes our problem a whole lot easier for this committee if we not necessarily use the word "sovereignty" but if we have a clear understanding that as far as the domestic rights of this Nation are concerned, we can apply the domestic law over this area just as though it were part of our land territory.

Mr. TATE. I believe that is correct, Senator. I am glad you say "whether you use the word 'sovereignty' or not." We do not, of course, agree with the position that the British took, and there are a number of other nations that do not agree. Belgium, for example. They feel, and maybe I am laboring the point too much, that when you talk about jurisdiction and control of the seabed and subsoil, it is clear that you mean something that is less than full sovereignty, which would include supra-adjacent waters and the air.

Senator DANIEL. We certainly could agree with you on that.

Mr. TATE. We can get into a semantic argument that wouldn't be profitable for either of us. I think that jurisdiction and control, as set forth in the proclamation and as now used in S. 1901, gives you, as far as I can see right now, everything that you would want by use of the word "sovereignty" with the qualification that you did not refer to the waters above.

Senator DANIEL. I thank you. That is exactly what I was trying to bring out. For all practical purposes, our Nation has the same rights as if we had used the word "sovereignty."

Now, in the interpretation of the President's proclamation, which is limited to mineral resources of the ground, it seems that both the Secretary of State in the concurrent press release, the Attorney General of the United States in his lawsuits against Texas and Louisiana, and the Supreme Court in its decrees, have treated the proclamation as though it covered the land itself, all of the area of the seabed and subsoil of the Continental Shelf. Is that not correct?

Mr. TATE. That is correct.

Senator DANIEL. And for all practical purposes, when we claim exclusive jurisdiction and control over the natural resources of the seabed and subsoil, have we not asserted exclusive jurisdiction over the seabed and subsoil itself?

Mr. TATE. For all practical purposes that I can think of, sir.

Senator DANIEL. We have?

Mr. TATE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on page 573 of the hearings there occurred this discussion between the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and Mr. Tate of the State Department:

Senator DANIEL. In other words, we can legislate with reference to our seabed and subsoil, just as completely and as effectively as the countries that use the word "annexation" or "boundaries" or "sovereignty" in speaking of their seabed and subsoil?

Mr. TATE. Well, I don't know that I am prepared to say that every other country can do under its claim. I would say that they can do what we can do, and that what we

can do is exercise full jurisdiction, full control, over this area.

Senator CORDON. That is, the land itself.

Mr. TATE. The land itself.

Senator DANIEL. We can treat it as though it was annexed or a part of the territory of the United States. Is that not correct?

Mr. TATE. As I said earlier, I don't see what the practical difference would be.

So, Mr. President, as I understand the testimony, it makes no difference that the Federal Government is not claiming jurisdiction and control over the water above the seabed and the air above the water; in any case, in my opinion, this land should be treated in the same manner as is treated any other land that has been acquired in the past by the Federal Government, by the various methods I have mentioned.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, excerpts from an article by R. S. Trigg, published in the University of Pennsylvania Law Review. The article is entitled "National Sovereignty Over Maritime Resources."

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United States claims only jurisdiction and control of the resources of the subsoil and seabed of the contiguous Continental Shelf. Thus in two ways the claim may be minimized in argument. It has been suggested that the jurisdiction includes only the resources in the subsoil, and not the subsoil itself. This, of course, is mere sophistry; one may as logically claim the maple syrup of the wood while denying any interest in the tree. But the other argument has more force. "Jurisdiction and control," . . . is far different from "sovereignty"; and though international law does not tolerate sovereignty outside the territorial belt, it has in many cases accepted claims of jurisdiction for certain purposes. This is, however, a distinction without a difference.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from an article entitled "The Continental Shelf," written by F. A. Valett, and published in the British Year Book of 1946. It was referred to in the colloquy to which I have just referred between the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and Mr. Tate.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is difficult to see what distinction there is between control over the natural resources and control over the subsoil and seabed itself. Anything of value might be included in natural resources, and any use or interference with the subsoil or seabed might equally be regarded as an interference with the use of their natural resources. Therefore it does not seem that the use of this expression imparts any real limitation, and the claim may be taken as relating to the subsoil and seabed themselves.

Indeed, the contemporaneous press release spoke simply of jurisdiction over the Continental Shelf. Moreover, jurisdiction and control are tantamount to sovereignty. Thus, notwithstanding the restrained language of the proclamation, it does appear to amount to a declaration that the Government of the United States regards the sovereignty over the Continental Shelf as belonging to the United States. (From The Continental Shelf, by F. A. Valett.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to his colleague?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does my colleague know that most of the nations which have considered this problem have claimed their land in just the way the Senator is now suggesting?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the next point I wish to call to the attention of the Senate. I shall not discuss this point in detail; but what my distinguished colleague has just said is correct, namely, that the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf bordering on Trinidad and Tobago, the Bahamas, British Honduras, the Falkland Islands, and Pakistan were acquired under the same theory, namely, under the doctrine of contiguity, but instead of claiming them by extending jurisdiction over the natural resources, as was done by President Truman in his 1945 proclamation, claim was asserted by either extension of boundaries or by annexation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, excerpts from the hearings indicating how those various bodies of seabed surrounding the islands and territories I have just mentioned have been acquired.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator DANIEL. Now, Mr. Tate, I would like for us to look at the British practice with respect to the Continental Shelf a little bit, since the United States has not objected to it.

First, looking at the United Kingdom's annexation of the submarine areas off the shores of Tobago and Trinidad: By order of August 6, 1942, the United Kingdom said:

"Whereas, it is expedient that the rest of the submarine areas of the Gulf of Paria should be annexed to and form part of His Majesty's dominions and should be attached to the colony of Trinidad and Tobago for administrative purposes: Now, therefore, His Majesty is pleased, by and with the advice of his Privy Council, to order, and it is hereby ordered"—

And it goes on to describe the area out into the middle of the Gulf of Paria, and says "shall be annexed to and form part of His Majesty's dominions and shall be attached to the colony of Trinidad and Tobago for administration purposes, and the said submarine areas are annexed and attached accordingly."

Senator DANIEL. The Bahamas, order in council, November 28, 1948, says this:

"The boundaries of the colony of the Bahamas are hereby extended to include the area of the Continental Shelf which lies beneath the sea contiguous to the coasts of the Bahamas." And it goes on to say that "nothing in this order shall be deemed to affect the character as high seas of any waters above the Continental Shelf and outside the limit of territorial waters."

Senator DANIEL. Now, back to the British practice: I believe I was about to take up with you the case of British Honduras. By order in council, October 9, 1950, the boundaries of British Honduras were altered, according to the terms used, and the order provides as follows:

"The boundaries of the colony of British Honduras are hereby extended to include the

area of the Continental Shelf which lies beneath the sea contiguous to the coast of British Honduras. Nothing in this order shall be deemed to affect the character as high seas of any waters outside the Continental Shelf and beyond the limits of territorial waters."

Senator DANIEL. I would like, for the benefit of the committee, to read exactly how the United Kingdom handled the Falkland Islands case, reading only one sentence, and I quote from the order in council of the United Kingdom, December 21, 1950:

"The boundaries of the colony of the Falkland Islands are hereby extended to include the area of the Continental Shelf, being the seabed and its subsoil contiguous to the coasts of the Falkland Islands."

And thereafter follows the same declaration—that it does not affect the high seas.

The same language, or practically the same, is used with reference to the Union of South Africa, and I would like to call attention to different language used by Pakistan. By declaration of the Governor General, March 9, 1950, the Governor General of Pakistan says that he hereby declares, in pursuance of clause (b) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Government of India Act, 1935—"that the seabed along the coast of Pakistan, extending to the 100-fathom contour in the open sea, shall, with effect from the date of this declaration, be included in the territories of Pakistan."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a colloquy occurred among other members of the committee and various witnesses, particularly with representatives of the State Department, on the question of whether jurisdiction and control over the seabed and subsoil are actually different from sovereignty. I believe the testimony adduced shows convincingly that even the State Department finds no difference between jurisdiction and control over the seabed, as extended in this bill, and sovereignty, with respect to our rights to the resources of the seabed and subsoil, and our right to apply domestic law, either Federal or joint State and Federal.

As I previously pointed out, and as the junior Senator from Texas so admirably emphasized in his questioning of Mr. Tate of the State Department, it does not make any difference how the jurisdiction and control over this area is applied, just so the seas above the submerged lands remain open and free to all nations. This is a practice which has often been followed with respect to structures erected in the sea by various nations, particularly lighthouses. In the case of lighthouses, the constructing nation acquires sovereignty over the structure, and the seabed or island upon which it is located. As a matter of fact, some 15 to 18 miles off the coast of my own parish of Terrebonne in the State of Louisiana there is a United States lighthouse known as Ship Shoal Light, which is built upon a submerged shell reef, and I am not aware of any foreign nation protesting our right to jurisdiction over it.

As I indicated previously, Mr. President, Congress is, in this measure, dealing with an entirely new field of law, and is considering a theory which strikes at the very heart of our basic republican system of dual State and Federal sovereignty. Are we going to continue this dual philosophy of government which, conceived by our Founding Fathers, has

made us so great? I believe we must, Mr. President, and the purpose of my amendment is to maintain this dual sovereignty, by extending to the States the right to administer civil and criminal laws in the area dealt with in the pending bill.

Mr. President, in this instance the Continental Shelf will add thousands of square miles of territory to the area of our Nation—territory which has, for years, been administered by the States bordering on the coast under laws enacted by those States. And this is only proper. Let us take, for example, the State of Massachusetts. As I recall, the land area around the State which will be taken over by the Federal Government is two and one-half times the present size of Massachusetts. If we are to judge by the past history of our Nation, the civil laws of Massachusetts should be followed in the administration of this area; and yet, what is now proposed? It is proposed that there be created a new area, unconnected with the State of Massachusetts, adjacent to its coast, over twice its size, yet governed by the Federal Government. In Louisiana, the land area to be added by virtue of the declaration of the President in 1945, and which is recognized in the pending measure, equals one-third of the present size of my State. Every coastal State of the Union that heretofore has had jurisdiction over these areas will find that jurisdiction removed from State hands, taken over by the Federal Government, and administered from Washington under what is admittedly a new concept of jurisprudence.

Admitting for the sake of argument that, as set forth in the Supreme Court's opinions in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases, the resources of the Continental Shelf are the property of the Federal Government, it must be borne in mind that the States are, in this bill, surrendering to the Federal Government all rights of political jurisdiction, including the power to police and tax the areas, as many of them have been doing in the past.

Mr. President, I ask permission to place in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from a statement made by Dr. Harold F. Clark, professor in charge of educational economics at Columbia University, which statement appears on pages 206 and 207 of the hearings. This statement emphasizes the point which I have just discussed as to the additional area that is being acquired by the Federal Government, erected as a new and hitherto-unknown variety of territory, and to be administered as no land in our history has been administered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. CLARK (continuing). I think probably the best thing to do is to turn the maps of the States, if you will just turn to them, and we will run through the States very hurriedly.

Take the first one, Alabama. The territory in black shows the amount of territory that would be added to the State of Alabama, approximately one-eighth additional territory.

The next State is the State of California, which adds approximately 20,000 miles to the State of California.

The next State is Delaware, which adds just a little less than its present land territory. Then I would like to stop a moment on Florida, if I may.

I have a large map here showing the counties of Florida.

Incidentally, I would not want to defend the legality of this. I am talking of the substance of it. I am talking of the economic substance.

This, in my opinion, is Florida [indicating]. The committee can say it is the law this year but, gentlemen, if I may say so, if you do not, the next Congress or some other one will. You have no alternative. That is Florida [indicating]. As you can see, the new Florida has about one and a third the amount of the old land territory.

The next State is Georgia, which adds approximately one-eighth of the land area.

The next State is Maine. It is an interesting thing that you have almost two Maines there. The ocean Maine is almost the same shape and size as the land State. That is figure 8.

The next is Maryland, which adds some one-third or one-fourth of the present land area.

Massachusetts is one of the oddest States of the Union. As all of you know, many of my good friends in New England think New England has an economic problem. It does have. They have been kind enough to invite me to come up and discuss with them some of their economic problems, and I have told them rather definitely that much of the greatness of New England was built from the sea. They have the greatest economic resource in the world. Massachusetts has 2½ times her land area, but they are not developing it.

New England has the resources. That is not a problem in New England. New England has the opportunity. There it is. It is just a case of whether you go out there and develop it.

The next State, Mississippi, which has approximately an eighth additional area on the Continental Shelf.

New Hampshire is a very odd case. It has a thin strip sticking out between Massachusetts and Maine. Some of my friends in New Jersey have told me, "New Jersey has no interest in this problem," but actually there is more of New Jersey which lies east of the coastline than west of it. The greatest area of economic development in New Jersey lies east of the coastline, if they see it. It is just up to the people in New Jersey whether they want to develop it.

New York is a curious situation.

North Carolina, fairly straightforward.

Oregon adds some 10,000 or 12,000 square miles.

Interesting little Rhode Island gets substantially more ocean than she has land.

South Carolina adds some 40 percent to her area.

Texas adds approximately 10 percent to her area.

Virginia, about an eighth.

Washington adds about 10,000 or 11,000 square miles.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, here is a factor these other coastal States might do well to consider. I ask Senators to remember that if this bill, as reported by the committee, becomes the law of our land, the coastal States will have surrendered to the Federal Government all police power over their Continental Shelf areas; they will have given up all power of taxation over them.

It is my considered judgment that future generations, the future inhabitants of these States, will judge such

action as extremely shortsighted. These lands may well be immensely more rich in natural resources than the present land area of the coastal States involved. For example, Dr. Clark, to whom I have referred previously, made the following prediction in his statement, which is printed in the hearings on this bill:

The land involved in our own ocean resources is probably more important to the future of the country than was the Louisiana Purchase to the Nation at that period.

All the main mineral elements of the world have been discovered in the ocean. Some major processing plants have been established for obtaining minerals from the ocean. Much of our bromine and iodine are extracted from the ocean. A very large fraction of all the magnesium currently used in the United States comes from a single plant extracting the mineral from the ocean. There are 6 million tons in a single cubic mile of ocean. For practical purposes, these supplies are unlimited. Every country in the world that has access to the ocean has an almost unlimited supply of magnesium.

All practical steps should be taken to further the procuring of more minerals from the ocean. There are many reasons to think, given time, money, and adequate encouragement to private initiative, that the results will be substantial. But surely the States are in a better position to do this than the Federal Government would be. If you allow the Federal Government to take all these economic resources, it will wind up in almost complete control of the economic life of the country. Inevitably, Washington will become the dictator of almost all our economic policies. There are very few Americans who want that result.

Mr. President, continuing scientific developments and the accelerated rate of depletion of our natural resources point to the fact that before many years we will be searching out and developing the mineral resources of the Continental Shelf which, as of today, are virtually untapped. And I should like to remind Senators again, that not just Louisiana, Texas, California, and Florida have Continental Shelf areas. Every coastal State in our Union is bordered by Continental Shelf lands. True, there has not been any oil found off the coast of Rhode Island as yet. But what would prevent other valuable and important mineral deposits from being found there, and perhaps in quantities infinitely more vast than the petroleum resources of the Gulf or Pacific Ocean? I say none, Mr. President, and I believe Senators should think this problem through very carefully before relinquishing the birthrights of their citizens to an already vast and powerful Federal Government.

I cannot help but remember, Mr. President, that 25 years ago the possibility of obtaining oil from the Continental Shelf was considered to be far-fetched—the scheme of an impractical dreamer. Today, there are producing wells many miles out into the open sea. Oil and gas are not the only resources found in the submerged lands. For example, I recall vividly back in the late 1920's when a deposit of sulfur was discovered in my own parish of Terrebonne, La., in the Bay St. Elaine area. This deposit was located in the marshes, just a few miles from the Gulf of Mexico. Everyone thought at that time it would

be impossible to mine the sulfur because of lack of fresh water and because of other physical obstacles. But today, the Bay St. Elaine dome is producing sulfur and helping alleviate the world shortage of that essential mineral, and our sulfur companies today are casting their eyes in the direction of the Continental Shelf.

It is only logical, Mr. President, that as our reserves of natural resources on the land areas of continental United States dwindle, the search for new sources inevitably will lead to the ocean beds that surround us. This is not a visionary scheme, by any means, Mr. President. It is already being done, and the efforts are not limited to the Gulf of Mexico or the Pacific Ocean off of California. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks a memorandum hastily prepared for me by the Library of Congress indicating some of the places where minerals are already being recovered from beneath the seabed and some of the methods used.

There being no objection, the memorandum referred to was ordered to be printed, as follows:

RECOVERY OF MINERALS FROM UNDER THE SEA

1. Alaska: Gold—Treadwell mine. Feldspar—Douglas I. near Juneau (opposite); down to 2,400 feet.

2. Nova Scotia—Sidney: Coal—several mines; actual production out to 1½ miles; exploration tunnels out to 3 miles.

3. Chile: Coal—Schwager mine, gulf of Aranco, 20 miles from Concepcion; nearly 2,000 feet down, up to 2 miles out.

4. Scotland—Firth of Clyde: Coal has been mined for 150 years; recent extensive new explorations.

5. Newfoundland: Dominion Wabana Ore, Ltd.; iron—operates 4 mines tunnelling from Bell Island out into Conception Bay. Producing about 1½ million tons per year; 1 mine 2,100 feet below sea level.

BY DREDGING BEYOND HIGH-TIDE MARK OR OTHER MEANS

1. United States—Florida: Monazite sands, by dredging.

2. India: Monazite sands, by dredging.

3. Philippines—Luzon Island: Gold and tin, by dredging around Paracale Bay.

4. United States: Sulfur, by drilling from Louisiana tidal marshes and seaward from there.

5. United States: Dow Chemical Co., Corpus Christi, Tex.: Magnesium from seawater by electrolysis.

6. England—Cornwall: Coal and tin, for hundreds of years, still being mined.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I mentioned the acute shortage of vital natural resources facing our Nation, and I indicated that this shortage is going to force us to seek hitherto unexplored sources of these minerals. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an excerpt from the report of the President's Materials Policy Committee, rendered in June of 1952, which calls attention to the alarming dissipation of our natural resources and the need for new sources of supply.

There being no objection, the excerpt referred to was ordered to be printed, as follows:

THE ROAD WE HAVE TRAVELED

The decade of the 1940's marked a crucial turning point in the long-range materials position of the United States. Historical

trends long in the making finally came to a climax when the national economy moved just prior to the war from a long period of depression into a period, still continuing, of high employment and production. By the midpoint of the 20th century we had entered an era of new relationships between our needs and resources; our national economy had not merely grown up to its resource base, but in many important respects had outgrown it. We had completed our slow transition from a raw materials surplus Nation to a raw materials deficit Nation.

The symptoms of this changed materials position are today numerous; we have become the world's largest importers of copper, lead, and zinc, whereas once we were huge exporters. We have begun to meet from foreign sources a sizable and growing portion of our needs for petroleum and iron ore, which long were hallmarks of United States self-sufficiency. We have shifted from net exporter to net importer of lumber. There are today only two metals, magnesium and molybdenum, for which we are not partially dependent on foreign supplies.

The United States has never been completely self-sufficient in raw materials; had we insisted on being so, our economic output and living standards today would be considerably lower than they are. We began as an underdeveloped Nation with rich resources but a shortage of manpower and capital, and little industry. For a long time we were predominantly agrarian; as late as 1870, we had three farmers for every manufacturing worker. It made good sense for us then, as it does for many less developed countries today, to concentrate on the export of raw materials and agricultural products as the best means of acquiring purchasing power abroad with which to support better living standards and economic growth.

With the growth of manufacturing, United States foreign trade burgeoned, and its composition underwent drastic change. As a seller in world markets, we shifted emphasis from raw materials to manufactured goods; as a buyer, we shifted emphasis from finished goods to raw materials. As a result of these shifts, crude materials fell from over 60 percent of our merchandise exports in 1820 to less than 15 percent by 1946-50; conversely, finished manufactured goods rose from less than 6 percent of our exports in 1820 to 52 percent by 1946-50. Opposite changes occurred in our pattern of imports.

The inevitable has now come to pass. Whereas for many decades the United States economy produced more raw materials than it consumed and thus had a net outflow of materials to the rest of the world, we seem now to have settled solidly into the position of consuming more materials than we produce.

Mr. ELLENDER. I call these factors to the attention of Senators from the other coastal States, because I sincerely believe that they have been overlooked in what appears to me to be a mad rush to get this bill rammed through the Congress and onto the President's desk for signature.

Can any Senator tell me that he conscientiously believes that this legislation affecting the Continental Shelf beyond the boundaries of the States, has received full and adequate consideration, in the light of the immensity and complexity of the issues involved? I say "No," Mr. President, and I should like for the RECORD to show that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. CORDON] has admitted that the hearings were conducted and the bill reported in

a race against time—in just a bit over 2 weeks. I read now from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 22, 1953, page 6962, at which point the chairman of the committee [Mr. CORDON] made the following statement:

I am mindful of the fact that at that time I said that within 2 weeks after the enactment of the submerged lands joint resolution, the committee would have before the Senate a bill providing for the administration of the area of the outer Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS FROM EXECUTIVE AGENCIES REQUIRED

The measure I am now discussing was reported on June 15, missing the deadline by several days. I apologize for the delay but by way of extenuation, I plead—

With respect to the amendment covering sulfur, the chairman admitted that the committee did not have time to go into the subject at sufficient length to reach "a sound, considered, and advised conclusion." The chairman stated, and this is found on page 6965 of the June 22 RECORD, as follows:

That may be the correct percentage; but because the committee did not have the time to go into the subject at sufficient length to reach a sound, considered, and advised conclusion, it set the minimum royalty at 10 percent. In its report, it requests the Secretary of the Interior to make a continuous study of the question and, after he has reached conclusions, to submit them to the committee so that corrective action may be taken, if necessary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there is no question that the pending bill is extremely complicated. Frankly, within the short period of time I have had in which to study it, I have been unable to ferret out all its implications. It is something new, and that fact has been admitted on many occasions by witnesses who appeared before the committee, as well as by committee members themselves.

At this point, I should like to place in the RECORD an excerpt from the report of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the pending measure, which reiterates the statement made by that committee when it reported Senate Joint Resolution 13, known as the first tidelands bill, in which it is stated that the issues presented are extremely complex, and that in all our legal and political experience there are no precedents to guide us. Yet with all that, with the little study that has actually been given by that committee, we are being asked, in a short space of time, to enact this legislation.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The complexity of the problem presented by the assumption by the United States of jurisdiction and control over the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf is immediately apparent from even a cursory examination of the Presidential proclamation. [Id est, proclamation No. 2667, issued September 28, 1945; the text is set forth in the appendix.] The declaration is limited to jurisdiction and control of the resources of the land mass; as stated in the

proclamation—"the character as high seas of the waters above the Continental Shelf and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation are in no way thus affected."

Clearly, we have here neither absolute sovereignty nor absolute ownership.

It must follow that the interest of the United States is, from a national and an international standpoint, politically and legally, *sui generis*. What Federal laws are applicable, what should apply? In what court, where situated, does jurisdiction lie or where should it be placed? Should new Federal law be enacted where existing statutes are wholly inadequate, or should the laws of abutting States be made applicable? The necessity for answering these questions is clear when we take note of the fact that the full developments of the estimated values in the shelf area will require the efforts and the physical presence of thousands of workers on fixed structures in the shelf area. Industrial accidents, accidental death, peace and order—these and many other problems and situations need and must have legislative attention.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I said, the pending bill takes us very far into an entirely new field of law. Yet, it is a bill which has been considered, not by the Judiciary Committee—which deals with matters concerning changes in our system of laws—but by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It occurs to me that the legal problems involved in the pending bill are so complex that the bill should have received the attention and study of the Judiciary Committee; and, before I conclude, I propose to show why that consideration was—and as far as I am concerned—still is necessary. However, for the time being, before offering my amendment, I desire to show how the application of laws to the lands which have in the past been acquired by the Federal Government, was heretofore handled.

In the amendment the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] and I propose to offer, we do not ask for any part of the revenues that are to be collected by the Federal Government. We are not advocating a law similar to the one which we now have on the statute books with respect to the distribution of revenues derived from public lands. However, I should like to point out to the Senate what the various States of the Union are receiving from public lands under a policy which gives the States a share of the revenues from Federal lands located within their respective borders—a policy which I assert has set the precedent for the administration of the submerged lands here in question; yet under the pending bill the coastal States are being denied the right to participate in the revenues from these marginal areas. Mr. President, I am not now questioning the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in which it has ruled that the Federal Government has paramount rights over the property in question, and the States have no claim to the underlying resources.

The Congress, in the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 13, which is now the law, has stated that the States are recognized as the owners of the submerged lands up to their historic bound-

aries, and that beyond those historic boundaries the ownership is in the United States Government.

I honestly believe that State boundaries should be extended, or the States should be given the right to extend their jurisdiction over these lands in the same manner as the Federal Government is extending its jurisdiction under this bill. Instead, the Federal Government has asserted full jurisdiction and control and seeks to exclude the Coastal States entirely, without even permitting them to participate in the revenues in the same manner as revenues are now being distributed among the States of the Union which contain federally owned lands.

Be that as it may, while I believe such participation in revenues would be only justice, I am not asking for that, Mr. President. If I should present such an amendment I know how many votes it would receive, so I am not requesting it at this time. I merely want to point out the injustice of the situation. The Senators who have been most vociferous against our requests for a share of the revenue from the newly acquired lands, represent States which are receiving millions of dollars annually from federally owned land.

Mr. President, under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 the State of Louisiana, which has some federally owned property, contributes, through the reclamation fund, over 52 percent of the revenues derived from such property to the great State of California, to the State of Arizona, and to the 15 other Reclamation States. Money derived from federally owned property is being taken from the State of Louisiana and used in 17 other States, to develop these States and to increase their wealth. It is true that the State of Louisiana receives 37½ percent of those funds, but 52½ percent is distributed among the 17 reclamation States.

Mr. President, funds from federally owned property are obtained in many ways; these moneys are derived from many sources, including grazing-land receipts; revenues from the Boulder Canyon project; Coos Bay wagon road grant fund; mineral lands leasing receipts; Alaska school land receipts, which are paid to Alaska; national forest receipts; fines for setting fire to timber; public lands receipts; receipts from lease of mineral deposits on acquired lands; receipts under the Migratory Bird Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that brief summaries of the various acts governing such receipts be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summaries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAZING-LAND RECEIPTS

The Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934, amended by acts of June 26, 1936, August 6, 1947, and June 19, 1948, provides that 12½ percent of grazing fees collected under section 3 of the act and 50 percent of moneys collected under section 15 is to be paid to the States in which the districts or lands producing the moneys are located, for the benefit of the local counties, and when appropriated by Congress, 33½ percent of grazing

fees received from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States is to be paid to the States in which the lands are located, for the benefit of schools and roads in the local counties. This act is administered by the Department of the Interior (48 Stat. 1273, secs. 10, 11; 49 Stat. 1978, sec. 4; 61 Stat. 791, ch. 507; 62 Stat. 533, ch. 548; U. S. Code 43: 3151, 3151j).

REVENUES FROM BOULDER CANYON PROJECT

The Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, amended by the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of July 19, 1940, and an act of May 14, 1948, provides that the Secretary of the Interior is to pay \$300,000 a year until May 31, 1987, to both Arizona and Nevada from revenues from the Boulder Canyon project, the Colorado River Dam fund (instead of 18½ percent of excess revenues formerly paid), but provides that in the event Arizona or Nevada or any taxing political subdivision thereof levies taxes upon the project, etc., payments to the States are to be reduced by an amount equivalent to the taxes collected.

The amending act of May 18, 1948, made the Colorado River Dam fund available also for annual appropriation for the fiscal years 1948, 1949, 1950, and 1951 for payments to the Boulder City School District, as reimbursement for actual cost of instruction of pupils who were dependents of employees of the United States living in or near Boulder City, such reimbursement not to exceed \$65 per semester per pupil (45 Stat. 1059, sec. 4 (b); 54 Stat. 774-779; 60 Stat. 368, ch. 529; 62 Stat. 235, ch. 292; U. S. Code 43: 317c, 618-618c).

COOS BAY WAGON ROAD GRANT FUND

Section 5 of an act of February 26, 1919, provided for reconveyance of certain lands in Oregon, known as the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant, to the United States. There is a provision that separate accounts of receipts from sale of reversioned lands and timber within each of the two counties of Coos and Douglas are to be kept, and after receipts amount to the sum of accrued taxes on the lands and \$2.50 an acre for the land reversioned, 25 percent of receipts are to be paid to the county in which the lands sold, etc., are located, for common schools, roads, highways, bridges, and port terminals, such payments to be made upon order of the Secretary of the Interior (40 Stat. 1180-1181, ch. 45, sec. 5).

An amending act of May 24, 1939, provides that 75 percent of receipts derived in any year from the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands is to be paid annually, in lieu of taxes, to the treasurers of Coos and Douglas Counties to be used for the purposes mentioned in the act of February 26, 1919, except that only 50 percent of the amount which would otherwise be paid to Douglas County is to be paid, until the fund is fully reimbursed by Douglas County as provided in section 5 of the earlier act (53 Stat. 753, ch. 144).

MINERAL LANDS LEASING RECEIPTS, ETC.

An act of October 2, 1917, provided that 50 percent of potassium royalties and rents was to be paid to the States within which the leased lands or deposits were located, to be used for roads or schools (40 Stat. 300, secs. 10, 11). This act was repealed by an act of February 7, 1927, below.

Section 1 and section 35 of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended or supplemented, provides that 37½ percent of the amounts derived from bonuses, royalties, and rentals from lease of certain public lands containing coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, sulfur, gold, silver, and quicksilver is to be paid to the State, or Alaska, within the boundaries of which the leased lands or deposits are located, for public roads, public schools, or public educational institutions. These acts are administered by the Depart-

ment of the Interior (Feb. 25, 1920, 41 Stat. 437-438, sec. 1; 450, sec. 35; April 17, 1926, 44 Stat. 302, ch. 158, sec. 5; June 8, 1926, 44 Stat. 710, sec. 2; Feb. 7, 1927, 44 Stat. 1058, sec. 5; Aug. 8, 1946, 60 Stat. 950-951, ch. 918, sec. 1, 957 sec. 11; May 27, 1947, 61 Stat. 119 ch. 83; June 1, 1948, 62 Stat. 279 ch. 356; Aug. 3, 1950, 64 Stat. 402, ch. 527, Pub. Law 645, 81st Cong.; United States Code and United States Code Supp. 30: 181, 191, 275, 285, 292).

An act of March 1, 1933, authorizes the payment of 37½ percent of royalties from oil or gas produced in the Navajo Indian Reservation to the State of Utah for tuition of Indian children and for road (47 Stat. 1418, ch. 160).

PAYMENTS TO ALASKA FROM ALASKA SCHOOL LAND RECEIPTS

An act of March 4, 1915, amended by an act of March 5, 1952, provides that proceeds or income derived from lands reserved under this act (for support of common schools and a Territorial agricultural college and school of mines) are appropriated and set apart as separate and permanent funds in the Territorial treasury (38 Stat. 1215, ch. 181; 66 Stat. 14, ch. 80, Public Law 270, 82d Cong.).

NATIONAL FOREST RECEIPTS

Acts of June 30, 1906, and March 4, 1907, provided that 10 percent of receipts from forest reserves were to be paid to the local State for schools and roads in the local county in which the forest reserve was located, but not to exceed 40 percent of the total county income from other sources.

These acts are superseded by an act of May 23, 1908, amended by an act of September 21, 1944, which provides that 25 percent of national forest receipts are to be paid to the local State or Territory for schools and roads in the local county in which the forest reserve is located and omits the proviso limiting payments to 40 percent of county income from other sources (35 Stat. 260; 58 Stat. 737, ch. 412, sec. 212; U. S. Code 16,500).

The Weeks Act of March 1, 1911, as amended provides that 25 percent of the receipts from national forest acquired under the provisions of this act is to be paid to the local State for schools and roads in the local county where the forests are located (Mar. 1, 1911, 36 Stat. 963, sec. 13; June 30, 1914, 38 Stat. 441; Sept. 21, 1944, 58 Stat. 737, ch. 412, sec. 212; Apr. 24, 1950, 64 Stat. 87 ch. 97, sec. 17 (b); U. S. Code and U. S. Code Supp. 16: 500).

An act of June 20, 1910, provides that a certain portion of receipts from national forests within New Mexico and Arizona is to be paid to those States annually for schools (36 Stat. 562, sec. 6, 573, sec. 24).

Acts of August 9, 1916 and March 4, 1917, amended by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 16, 1946, provide that money received on account of charges in connection with the utilization, etc., of mineral resources of the forest lands acquired under the Weeks law are to be disposed of as is provided by law for disposition of receipts from national forests (39 Stat. 462; 39 Stat. 1150; 60 Stat. 1099, sec. 402; U. S. Code 16: 520).

All of these acts were administered by the Department of Agriculture, but the functions of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to uses of mineral deposits were transferred to the Secretary of the Interior under section 402 of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 16, 1946.

An act of June 30, 1950, which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to permit prospecting for minerals within national forests in Minnesota, provides that all receipts derived from permits or leases under this act are to be paid into the same funds and are to be distributed in the same manner as prescribed for national forest revenue by 16 U. S. Code 499, 500 and 501 (64 Stat. 311-312,

ch. 430; Public Law 594, 81st Cong.; U. S. Code 16: 508b).

**FINES FOR SETTING FIRE TO TIMBER, ETC.,
ON PUBLIC LANDS**

Acts of February 24, 1897, May 5, 1900, and November 15, 1941, incorporated in the Criminal Code of March 4, 1909, provided that fines collected from persons setting fire to timber, etc., on public lands, etc., are to be paid into the public school fund of the county in which the lands where the offense was committed are situated. These acts have been repealed and the same provisions incorporated in title 18 of the United States Code, enacted on June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 788, 840, ch. 645, secs. 1855-1856, 3613).

PUBLIC-LANDS RECEIPTS

Various acts dating from March 3, 1803, to June 20, 1910, provide for payment of 3 or 5 percent of proceeds from the sale of public lands in specified States to the local State for roads, schools, canals, irrigation and levees, internal improvements, or improving the navigation of rivers. These acts are administered by the Department of the Interior (2 Stat. 226, sec. 2, 643, sec. 5; 3 Stat. 290, sec. 6, 349, sec. 5, 424, ch. 49, 430, sec. 6, 491, sec. 6, 547, sec. 6, 610, ch. 2, 674, ch. 48; 5 Stat. 58, ch. 120, 60, ch. 121, 116, sec. 63, 457, sec. 16, 17, 788, sec. 1, 790, ch. 76; 9 Stat. 58, sec. 7, 179, sec. 3, 349 ch. 78; 11 Stat. 187, sec. 5, 270, sec. 1, 384, sec. 4, 388, ch. 65; 12 Stat. 127, sec. 3; 13 Stat. 32, sec. 10, 34, sec. 10, 49, sec. 12; 18 Stat. 476, sec. 12; 25 Stat. 680, sec. 13; 26 Stat. 216, sec. 7, 223, sec. 7; 28 Stat. 110, sec. 9; 34 Stat. 274, sec. 11, 518, ch. 3557; 36 Stat. 563, sec. 9, 574, sec. 27).

**RECEIPTS FROM LEASE OF MINERAL DEPOSITS ON
ACQUIRED LANDS**

The Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands of August 7, 1947, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to lease deposits of minerals owned by the United States in lands acquired by the United States, to which the mineral-leasing laws have not been extended. Receipts derived from leases are to be paid into the same funds or accounts and be distributed in the same manner as other receipts from the lands affected by the lease, except receipts from Indian lands (61 Stat. 913-915, ch. 513; U. S. C. Supp. 30: 351-359).

RECEIPTS UNDER THE MIGRATORY BIRD ACT

An act of June 15, 1935, as amended by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of May 9, 1939, provides that 25 percent of moneys received from sale of surplus wildlife, timber, etc., from wildlife refuges, is to be paid to the counties in which the refuges are situated, for the benefit of schools and roads. This act is administered by the Department of the Interior (49 Stat. 383, sec. 401; 53 Stat. 1433 (f); U. S. C. 16: 715a).

MR. ELLENDER. Mr. President, these are revenues which are collected by the Federal Government from Federal lands within the various States. As is provided by the applicable act, a percentage of the collections remain in the States. For what purpose? To pay for schools, for roads, and for other activities which the States undertake for the benefit of their inhabitants.

Are we of Louisiana and the other coastal States asking for that under my proposed amendment? No. We are not asking for a dime of that money, although I believe we are as much entitled to it as are the States in which there is federally owned land from which the States collect 37½ percent from all the minerals produced. In addition, 17 of our States have a most-favored status, for 52½ percent of the mineral revenues derived from all States

is accumulated and distributed among the 17 reclamation States of the Union.

If the pending bill accords just and fair treatment to the coastal States, I do not know what those words mean. Yet, Mr. President, under my amendment the coastal States do not ask for any of that money. All we are asking in the amendment is the privilege of taxing those who develop the natural resources which are located on the submerged lands adjacent to the coastal States. We ask only the right to impose State severance or production taxes on the amount of oil, gas, or other natural resource recovered by the lessees. That portion which goes to the Federal Government would not be taxed. In other words, Mr. President, what my amendment undertakes to do is simply permit the coastal States to impose the same kind of tax that is now being paid, for example, by all who produce oil, gas, and other minerals from lands located in my own State. We are not asking for any portion of the Federal revenues from these newly found lands. The bill will remain as written. There is a clause in the bill which provides, in effect, that even if the State laws are extended to this newly found territory, that extension shall in no manner give to the States the right to obtain any portion of the revenues from the natural resources therein.

On page 4 of the bill it is provided as follows:

(3) The provisions of this section for adoption of State law as the law of the United States shall never be interpreted as a basis for claiming any interest in or jurisdiction on behalf of any State for any purpose over the seabed and subsoil of the outer Continental Shelf, or the property and natural resources thereof or the revenues therefrom.

That language, Mr. President, remains in the bill.

I repeat, that all I am asking for by my amendment is the right to impose the same kind of severance tax that is now being collected by my State from producers of oil, gas, and other natural resources within its boundaries.

I even go a step further, Mr. President. My amendment would fix the rate of the tax at its present level—

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

MR. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, between lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

(h) (1) Each adjacent State may extend its jurisdiction and laws (except as provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection and to the extent that such laws are inconsistent with the laws of the United States heretofore or hereafter enacted or with the rules and regulations of the Secretary issued in pursuance to the provisions of this act) to that portion of the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf, and artificial islands and fixed structures erected thereon for the purpose of exploring for, developing, removing, and transporting resources therefrom, within the area defined with respect to such State under subsection (a) (2). No State shall exercise its jurisdiction over

such area so as to interfere with the jurisdiction, control, and power of disposition vested in the United States by this act.

(2) When a State has so extended its jurisdiction and laws—

(A) the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall no longer apply to such portion of the subsoil and seabed or to such artificial islands and fixed structures;

(B) the Constitution and laws and civil and political jurisdiction of the United States shall extend thereto to the same extent as in the case of lands beneath navigable waters as defined in section 2 of the Submerged Lands Act and artificial islands and fixed structures erected thereon; and

(C) mineral leases on the outer Continental Shelf shall continue to be maintained or issued only under the provisions of this act.

(3) Any State which extends its jurisdiction and laws pursuant to the provisions of this section shall furnish a certified copy of the act so providing within 30 days of its passage to the Secretary, who shall publish it in the Federal Register.

(4) Except in the case of any law in effect on the date of the enactment of this act in any such State which provides for a production, severance, or similar tax on the production of metals or minerals (including oil and gas), no law providing for the raising of revenue shall be extended under the provisions of this subsection. Any law providing for such a production, severance, or similar tax may be so extended except that—

(A) it shall not be applicable to any portion of such production paid to the United States under the provisions of this act;

(B) The rates of such tax under such extension shall not be greater than those in effect within such State on the date of the enactment of this act; and

(C) such rates shall not be increased after such extension without the consent of Congress.

On page 16, beginning with the comma in line 20, strike out all to the semicolon in line 2 on page 17.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Louisiana.

MR. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

MR. KUCHEL. Is my understanding correct that the Senate is now operating under the unanimous-consent agreement which provides that time on any amendment is limited to 20 minutes to each Senator?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The time is limited to 20 minutes to each Senator on each amendment.

MR. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I stated just before the reading of my amendment, the coastal States are not asking for a copper cent from any portion of the revenues that would be derived by the Federal Government from the resources which may be developed. Those revenues will be retained by the Federal Government. However, at this point, Mr. President, I wish to point out what other States have been receiving under almost similar circumstances. We are not asking for any of the revenues, but I merely cite these revenues to show the injustice of what is sought to be done here today to the coastal States, which have had jurisdiction over the coastal waters from time immemorial.

Payments to States under the Mineral Leasing Act, which I mentioned a while ago, are only one of the examples. The amount paid to States since the Mineral Leasing Act has been on the statute books is \$114,136,809.46. That amount has been derived from 37½ percent of the revenues collected by the Federal Government from the development of oil, gas, and other mineral resources on federally owned property.

In presenting my amendment I am not asking for such payments. All I am asking for is the right of the State to impose a severance or production tax. I desire only that all operators producing oil, gas, and other resources within my State shall be placed on the same footing as those who operate in the Gulf of Mexico beyond the historic boundary. We are not asking for one cent of the revenues that would be collected by the Federal Government.

What the States would do in return for this tax would be to take care of all the personnel of the operating companies. We would give them access to our courts, both criminal and civil, the use of our roads, and the benefit of our schools, and various other institutions which are now being operated for the benefit of the people of the State of Louisiana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a list indicating some of the benefits the State of Louisiana will provide those persons and their families who come to reside in our State by virtue of their employment in development of the lands of the outer Continental Shelf.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed, as follows:

- Free public schools.
- Free textbooks and bus transportation to school.
- Free school lunches.
- Highways and streets.
- Hospitals for the indigent sick; tuberculosis and mental disease hospitals.
- State-financed medical schools and institutions of higher learning.
- Police protection.
- Public health and sanitation supervision.
- Old-age pensions.
- Court facilities.
- State unemployment compensation.
- Homestead exemptions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the distribution of funds accruing under the mineral leasing acts among the various States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Receipts and payments to States under mineral leasing acts

State	Amount received ¹	Amount paid to States ²
Alabama.....	\$217,101.11	\$79,555.08
Alaska.....	400,645.59	4,136.25
Arizona.....	375,080.52	83,106.35
Arkansas.....	33,518.08	2,006.67
California.....	103,977,333.30	32,215,463.00

¹ Mineral Leasing Act, public laws, acts of Feb. 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437); Aug. 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913); Oct. 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741); Oct. 2, 1917 (40 Stat. 297); Feb. 7, 1927 (44 Stat. 1057); May 9, 1942 (56 Stat. 273); Mar. 4, 1923 (42 Stat. 1448); June 20, 1926 (44 Stat. 1261). Brief resume of net—provisions and applicability. Brief background—why enacted, etc.

² Acts of Feb. 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437); Oct. 2, 1917 (40 Stat. 297); Feb. 7, 1927 (44 Stat. 1057).

Receipts and payments to States under mineral leasing acts—Continued

State	Amount received ¹	Amount paid to States ²
Colorado.....	28,572,528.48	8,361,615.73
Florida.....	37,122.04	90.00
Georgia.....	4,443.96	—
Idaho.....	633,213.72	196,322.64
Illinois.....	130,896.60	21.50
Indiana.....	3,197.50	—
Kansas.....	458,745.46	139,622.54
Kentucky.....	1,791.05	—
Louisiana.....	7,665,768.48	309,644.40
Maine.....	37.24	—
Maryland.....	295.00	—
Michigan.....	100,562.06	8,280.83
Minnesota.....	140.50	—
Mississippi.....	601,417.58	3,018.09
Missouri.....	9,614.26	—
Montana.....	12,695,246.40	3,964,056.02
Nebraska.....	671,955.64	5,213.11
Nevada.....	2,190,837.18	470,220.15
New Hampshire.....	32.24	—
New Mexico.....	47,274,414.43	14,682,202.99
North Carolina.....	3,537.98	—
North Dakota.....	1,061,110.44	318,187.64
Ohio.....	240,115.66	—
Oklahoma.....	2,529,896.15	74,211.57
Oregon.....	62,236.90	10,686.97
South Carolina.....	428.03	—
South Dakota.....	406,933.56	75,085.22
Tennessee.....	419,346.33	—
Texas.....	10,716,123.86	2,994,589.45
Utah.....	34,200.24	—
Virginia.....	16,898.50	—
West Virginia.....	99,523.88	33,332.78
Washington.....	150,474,566.82	50,166,109.39
Wyoming.....	—	—
Total.....	372,152,870.27	114,136,809.46

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a table indicating the amounts received by States under the Taylor Grazing Act.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Payments to States under Federal Grazing Act (Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269—H. R. 6462, 73d Cong., 2d sess.))

State	Payments		Total ¹
	Section 3 ¹	Section 15 ¹	
Arizona.....	\$226,658	\$200,215	\$426,900
Arkansas.....	—	192	192
California.....	134,751	156,109	290,860
Colorado.....	295,421	77,656	373,077
Idaho.....	464,922	59,320	524,242
Kansas.....	—	128	128
Louisiana.....	—	6	6
Minnesota.....	—	32	32
Montana.....	266,354	196,762	463,216
Nebraska.....	—	2,471	2,471
Nevada.....	744,353	264	744,617
New Mexico.....	722,694	61,275	783,939
North Dakota.....	—	6,407	6,407
Oklahoma.....	—	948	948
Oregon.....	348,406	46,428	394,834
South Dakota.....	—	31,331	31,331
Utah.....	852,482	—	852,482
Washington.....	—	33,715	33,715
Wyoming.....	648,877	611,072	1,259,949
Total ²	4,704,888	1,484,368	6,189,256

¹ Provisions of act: Sec. 3—Lands in grazing districts. Sec. 15—Lands not in grazing districts. Sec. 19—Disposition of receipts: 25 percent to range improvements, 50 percent to State in which revenue accrues. Sec. 11—When appropriated by Congress: revenues from grazing on Indian lands: 25 percent to range improvements, 25 percent to States, and 50 percent to credit of Indians.

² Figures rounded—totals will not add.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the payments to States from the sale of public lands.

There being no objection, the table referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Payments to States out of receipts from sales of public lands

	Total
Alabama.....	\$1,086,193.93
Arizona.....	53,241.28
Arkansas.....	348,007.92
California.....	1,205,638.79
Colorado.....	531,348.85
Florida.....	177,212.68
Idaho.....	320,047.24
Illinois.....	1,187,970.09
Indiana.....	1,040,255.26
Iowa.....	633,647.87
Kansas.....	1,128,250.21
Louisiana.....	471,212.08
Michigan.....	590,539.15
Minnesota.....	595,991.47
Mississippi.....	1,075,178.67
Missouri.....	1,061,280.87
Montana.....	598,930.70
Nebraska.....	577,387.30
Nevada.....	52,886.44
New Mexico.....	154,603.74
North Dakota.....	540,783.33
Ohio.....	999,353.01
Oklahoma.....	67,943.95
Oregon.....	803,510.81
South Dakota.....	349,869.48
Utah.....	188,992.20
Washington.....	460,298.03
Wisconsin.....	589,571.19
Wyoming.....	329,072.43
Total.....	17,217,078.96

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, receipts under the Mineral Leasing Acts are one source of revenue. The money distributed to the States under those acts represents 37½ percent of the revenues obtained by the Federal Government. That amount is paid to the States in lieu of taxes. My amendment does not ask for such a benefit as that. I repeat, all we are asking for is the privilege of imposing the same kind of tax on those who operate on the submerged lands as is imposed on those who operate on dry land. My amendment would freeze the severance or production tax at the present rate, and would not require the Federal Government to pay to the States any portion of the oil or other resource that may be obtained. If States should desire to increase the tax, they would be required to obtain the consent of Congress. I do not know of anything fairer than that. My purpose in offering the amendment is to continue the dual system of sovereignty that has made the United States of America so great, and to eliminate the myriad hardships the pending bill will create.

Mr. President, I pointed out a moment ago the amount of money accruing from federally owned property that has been received by various States in lieu of taxes. Now I shall proceed to show what the 17 reclamation States have obtained from a fund created by taking 52½ percent of the proceeds of all the minerals that have been found on federally owned land. This fund has been dedicated by the Congress for reclamation purposes.

As I have said, there are 17 States in the reclamation group. Up to June 30, 1950, the total amount accruing to the reclamation fund, as proceeds from oil and other resources was \$286,162,499.61.

Louisiana, which is not one of the reclamation States, has paid \$446,940.17 to bring the benefits of reclamation to the 17 reclamation States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I have referred, indicating accretions to the reclamation fund by States, which is printed in the Annual Report of the Commissioner of the Bureau of Recla-

mation, be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE 18.—Accretions to reclamation fund by States, fiscal year 1952

State	Sale of public land		Proceeds from Oil Leasing Act		Total to June 30, 1952
	Fiscal year 1952	To June 30, 1952	Fiscal year 1952	To June 30, 1952	
Alabama.....		\$4,372.65	\$1,881.07	\$200,973.42	\$205,346.07
Arizona.....	\$19,099.93	2,898,985.62	59,784.44	135,348.46	3,034,334.08
Arkansas.....			216.30	2,999.38	2,999.38
California.....	416,918.89	9,257,951.19	4,053,138.07	47,286,939.65	56,844,390.84
Colorado.....	88,580.08	10,640,358.69	3,156,044.14	13,273,939.30	23,914,207.99
Florida.....			15.75	141.75	141.75
Idaho.....	113,483.13	7,408,029.29	59,699.11	306,338.98	7,714,368.27
Illinois.....			10.50	31.50	31.50
Kansas.....	26.78	1,030,932.91	57,603.69	211,063.06	1,251,025.67
Louisiana.....			22,323.17	446,940.17	446,940.17
Michigan.....			950.01	12,045.90	12,045.90
Mississippi.....			924.65	4,573.75	4,573.75
Montana.....	72,468.93	15,694,631.66	801,281.72	5,963,685.91	21,658,617.57
Nebraska.....	1,994.70	2,168,545.64	1,025.06	7,833.86	2,166,379.50
Nevada.....	11,908.22	1,117,828.04	249,522.00	703,785.23	1,821,613.27
New Mexico.....	38,222.56	6,957,440.46	3,119,319.39	18,963,715.08	25,921,155.54
North Dakota.....	16,419.45	12,262,399.69	60,153.23	462,954.93	12,725,354.92
Oklahoma.....	9,629.69	5,961,000.91	29,240.08	118,608.67	6,079,609.58
Oregon.....	600,345.72	13,195,111.41	7,547.62	18,098.08	13,213,209.49
South Dakota.....	6,150.70	7,753,219.75	16,189.00	113,863.28	7,867,083.03
Utah.....	50,712.95	4,590,957.09	1,437,966.28	4,981,002.06	9,571,959.15
Washington.....	183,915.93	8,058,289.27	1,176.30	51,603.66	8,109,892.93
Wyoming.....	35,540.81	9,144,315.02	6,952,767.24	74,752,613.85	83,896,928.87
Total.....	1,665,706.47	118,143,669.59	20,088,779.72	168,018,830.02	286,162,499.61
Proceeds, Federal water-power licenses.....					1,262,714.92
Proceeds, potassium royalties and rentals.....					5,588,762.16
Receipts from Naval petroleum reserves, 1920-38, act of May 9, 1938.....					29,778,300.23
Proceeds from rights-of-way over withdrawn lands, act of July 19, 1919.....					10,978.25
Lease of lands.....					51,898.02
Town lot sales.....					724,645.77
Timber sales and other miscellaneous items.....					191,223.33
Grand total.....					323,788,022.29
Proceeds for fiscal year.....					\$119,817.42
Proceeds for fiscal year.....					1,027,342.16
Proceeds for fiscal year.....					427.61
Proceeds for fiscal year.....					19,917.63
Proceeds for fiscal year.....					1,100.04
Proceeds for fiscal year.....					32,528.60
Total.....					1,198,333.46

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in Bossier Parish, La., the Federal Government has recently made a big oil leasing deal with respect to an airport at Barksdale Field. Barksdale Field is an area of 30,000 acres of land, donated to our Government by people in and around Bossier Parish and Shreveport, La., for national defense purposes. The land is owned by the Federal Government, and a large oil field was recently discovered there. What is happening? The proceeds from the oilfield—which is found on land donated by the people of that area—to the extent of 52½ percent, are being made available to the 17 reclamation States, including the great State of Oregon, represented so ably by my good friend from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. That is all right with me. I am not complaining about it. I am simply presenting these facts to indicate to the Senate the injustice which is sought to be done to the coastal States.

The submerged land is land which was under State jurisdiction for hundreds of years before it was taken over by the Federal Government; and yet when this bill is passed, such a condition will be created there that if there is an infraction of law in that area, the accused may not be tried in Louisiana. He may be tried in Texas, if the area is nearer the State of Texas than it is to Louisiana. That is what will happen. That

is the condition which would be created by the passage of this bill.

If the bill is enacted, I am wondering what will happen with respect to the enforcement of criminal law. As I see it, the bill does not extend jurisdiction to any of the Federal judicial districts. This area is separate and apart from the State. It is there by itself. Yet the sixth amendment to the Constitution provides that—

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed—

How would that be accomplished under the provisions of the bill, if a crime were committed on any of the artificial islands created along the coast for the purpose of developing these natural resources? Where would the accused be tried? The area is no part of any judicial district. It is not the home of the possible defendant. Yet the sixth amendment provides that—

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed—

That is only one of the many defects which I am sure would be found by a complete study of this measure. I do not like to have the Senate go haywire

on a matter as important as this. The bill should receive the study of the Judiciary Committee, with a view toward clarifying and simplifying its administration. The bill should be referred to the Judiciary Committee with instructions that the status quo be preserved insofar as the administration of the civil and criminal laws is concerned. Otherwise we shall do violence to the citizens of Louisiana and to the citizens of every other coastal State. That is what will happen. I do not believe the Senate wants to do that.

My amendment is very simple and it would clarify a multiplicity of problems which are bound to arise. It would give coastal States the right to extend their jurisdiction to these lands. For what purpose? Merely for the purpose of administering the criminal and civil laws which may pertain to that area. As I pointed out a while ago, we leave in the bill that part which provides that, although the State has jurisdiction over the criminal and civil laws in that area, the bill shall in no wise be construed to give the States the right to any portion of these resources.

Mr. President, the whole Nation is talking about balancing the budget. I am curiously awaiting information as to the amount which is to be requested to administer the mineral development off the coast of Louisiana. I am waiting to hear how much that will be. I am satisfied that my great State would gladly use its own officials, under the supervision of the Federal Government, through the Interior Department, to administer these areas free of charge to the Federal Government, without having the Federal Government, pay a single solitary dime, and that the State would be willing to turn over to the Federal Government every cent of revenue which comes as its share, including bonuses, royalties and everything else. All of this would be accomplished—and all the coastal States ask is the right to tax the operators—just as we now tax the operators who explore for oil just across the line from where the Federal Government's land is located.

As I have said, all this would be done by the States without cost to the Federal Government. The conservation laws of my State are of the best. Those in Texas are second to none. Here is an opportunity for the Federal Government to have these Continental Shelf resources administered without having to pay out a single solitary dime in direct administrative expenses. The bill could be written so as to do no violence to the many inhabitants of the coastal States who have been under the jurisdiction of those States from the time of their creation. The great natural resource could be watched over, and leases for their development could be made by the State under the supervision of the Interior Department.

The conservation laws which now exist in the States, coupled with some that may be provided by the Department of the Interior, could be administered by State officials under the supervision of the Federal Government, without costing the United States Treasury so much as a dime, except as it may be necessary

to pay the persons who would supervise the work done by the State of Louisiana.

Mr. President, I cannot understand why the committee has seen fit to take the course it has taken with respect to administration of the lands dealt with in the pending measure.

They have made it difficult, whereas it could have been made quite simple. The fact that law and order will be hard to administer, and the fact that legal procedure will be complicated is due entirely to the course taken by the committee in writing the bill. It could have been made simple. So far as I am concerned, I would invite placing in the measure any language that may be suggested in order to make it certain that the coastal States would have the right to tax for the purpose of providing for schools, roads, and administration of laws in the area, and to stop there; and to provide that the Federal Government shall receive free of charge all the revenues that may be collected from those waters.

Mr. President, I see that my time has expired. I am hopeful that Senators will take heed of what I have said and restudy the question in the light of the facts I have presented, because I know, if enacted, the bill will create many hardships for the people who have lived in Louisiana and the other coastal States all their lives, and who, as I understand, could be tried elsewhere, if charged with a crime. Of course they would have the right to demand the protection of the Constitution, but this involves costly court procedure, so why impose this burden upon them? Why should violence be done to our traditional and constitutional guaranty that no citizen of the United States may be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law?

Mr. President, again I appeal to the Senate to adopt this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the senior Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by my distinguished senior colleague, on behalf of the two of us. It seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana, when efforts are made to develop the outer Continental Shelf, that those who receive the benefits of State services should be willing to contribute to the support of such services.

In this instance the Federal Government proposes to take possession of the Continental Shelf and develop it. It is unquestionably true that in doing so it will receive the benefits of certain State services. The persons working on the outer Continental Shelf will be entitled to the use of the roads and highways of the State, and the oil companies working in that area will also be entitled to the use of the State's roads and highways. The evidence shows that the large trucks of the oil companies do a great deal of damage, and they will do particularly great damage to the roads in the swamp areas of my State. Some consideration should be given to the enormous damage that will occur to the highways and roads of my State by reason of such use.

It is also true that in order to drill wells on the outer Continental Shelf workers will have to build enormous plat-

forms for the drilling operations. To support that type of operation it will be necessary to create a large shore base costing as much as \$2 million. All the people working in that area, and in drilling the wells on the outer Continental Shelf, would have their children going to schools supported by the State. The State, in other words, would provide education, and the cost of it would be largely borne by the State of Louisiana.

The principal source of revenue received by the State is derived from the severance tax. The oil industry within our boundaries would be bearing the burden of that support for education, while the companies engaged on the outer Continental Shelf would not be bearing their fair share of such cost. There is no reason why these companies should not pay their share.

Another major expense which the State would face would be in connection with providing hospital facilities, and services that would be available to the workers on the outer Continental Shelf. Nevertheless, the State would not receive any reimbursement from the industry developing the outer Continental Shelf because of affording such facilities and services.

Furthermore, the State must provide police protection and sanitation services, and similar services.

The State would also have to provide for the support of the aged. That item is becoming one of major expense.

Making provision for education, for hospitalization, for the aged, and for orphaned children is one of the greatest expenses which a State government must assume.

For those reasons the burdens placed on a coastal State, by reason of operations conducted on the outer Continental Shelf, are just as heavy as if those properties were located within the State boundaries. Therefore, my colleague is entirely correct in arguing that the State should be permitted to collect the severance tax, which the State now collects from the same industry located within its boundaries, and which it now collects whether the property is privately owned or Government owned, or in whatever way the property may be owned. That argument is entirely valid in this instance.

It is interesting to note, Mr. President, that in some cases the Federal Government is making payments in lieu of taxes where it has undertaken projects of various kinds in a State in order to confer benefits on its people. For example, in Tennessee, where the Federal Government has constructed vast dams, in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Federal Government has provided, in the first instance, for reimbursing the State for taxes which the State could not collect by virtue of the fact that the State had lost land from its tax rolls because the land was covered by water.

The Federal Government has provided for payments in lieu of taxes on power-development equipment purchased for the distribution of electricity generated by those dams.

Moreover, the Federal Government has made provision for payments in lieu of taxes to make up for loss of taxes

because a State could no longer collect taxes on the profits and general operations of the private companies engaged in generating and distributing electric power.

Those are areas where the Federal Government is paying millions of dollars to a State for the privilege of conferring benefits on a State.

Here is an operation where the State will supply services which will make it possible for the Federal Government to develop vast reserves on the outer Continental Shelf. It seems only fair that the Federal Government should be willing to make some arrangement with the coastal States whereby the benefits and the services which the Government receives, as well as the benefits which private corporations and individuals receive, in developing the area, would be compensated for insofar as the States are concerned.

The most equitable and fair method, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Louisiana, would be for the State to collect the severance tax.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am happy to join my distinguished senior colleague in urging the adoption of the amendment we have offered.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am speaking on the amendment. I rise to oppose it. The issue is most complex and difficult. The committee spent many days—and nights—running into weeks considering the question here presented before S. 1901 was reported.

The issue is whether an area which is entirely outside the boundaries of a State in an area of exclusive Federal jurisdiction shall, in effect, be placed within the boundaries of an abutting State. The committee felt that the boundaries of the coastal States should not be so extended. I believe the Senate entertains the same view.

Mr. President, I see no need to add more to the record which has been made in the course of the debate on the pending measure and in the course of the much more extended debate on substantially the same subject in the Submerged Lands Act which was before the Senate as Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the distinguished Senator from Oregon give us the benefit of his opinion on the following situation: Suppose a murder is committed on one of the islands. Who will have jurisdiction? Where will the accused be tried? How does this bill conform to the requirements of the sixth amendment to the Constitution?

Mr. CORDON. First, Mr. President, I suggest that the proper person to make answer to those questions is either the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] or the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] who supported the amendment which is now a part of the bill.

However, I am perfectly willing to venture an answer on my own. The bill provides for jurisdiction by the district courts of the United States. So in the

instance referred to by the Senator from Louisiana, jurisdiction would be either in the district court of the district in which the defendant was found or in the district court of the district nearest where the act occurred; and either represents jurisdiction within the meaning of the law and the Constitution.

Mr. ELLENDER. How would that conform to the requirements of the sixth amendment to the Constitution, which states that—

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed—

The crime would not have been committed in a district of Texas or in an existing Territory, but would have been committed in new territory.

Under the law, as I understand it, if a criminal were apprehended in Massachusetts even though the crime was committed in Louisiana, he could be tried in Massachusetts.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In that connection, what would be the effect of the sixth amendment, which gives the accused "the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed."

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is aware that a defendant charged with commission of a crime can be tried in the district in which he is found or in the district into which he is first brought.

Mr. ELLENDER. That may be true under maritime law, but—

Mr. CORDON. The Senator was discussing only the constitutional question. If the constitutional amendment to which he has referred forbids the kind of procedure in this case, it would forbid the procedure with reference to maritime law.

Mr. ELLENDER. But, Mr. President, we are dealing here not with offenses committed on the high seas outside the territorial limits of the United States, where maritime laws prevail, but instead with an area where domestic law, including the Federal Constitution, is to apply, and—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have finished.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from Oregon permit me to have sufficient time in which to answer?

Mr. CORDON. I do not have time that I can yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it appears that we shall have difficulty in obtaining a quorum. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I desire to call up my amendment identified as "6-23-53-D."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, beginning with line 13, to strike out all through line 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 3. Jurisdiction over outer Continental Shelf: (a) It is hereby declared that the seabed and subsoil of the outer Continental Shelf, the natural resources therein contained, and any structures which are erected on such subsoil or seabed for the purpose of exploring for, developing, removing, and transporting the natural resources of such subsoil or seabed, are within the territory of the United States.

On page 3, beginning with line 11, to strike out all through line 13 on page 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 4. Extension of State boundaries to seaward extremity of outer Continental Shelf: (a) The Congress hereby consents, subject to the condition set forth in subsection (d) of this section, to the action of any coastal State in extending its seaward boundary to the seaward extremity of the outer Continental Shelf, so as to include within its boundaries the seabed and subsoil of the outer Continental Shelf, the natural resources therein contained, and any structures of the type described in section 3 (a): *Provided*, That such action be taken pursuant to legislative statute or constitutional provision.

(b) Subject to the provisions of subsection (d) of this section, the extension of its seaward boundaries under the provisions of this section shall have the effect of making the laws of such State applicable to the newly acquired area, and shall have the effect of empowering the officials of such State to enforce the laws of the State in the newly acquired area.

(c) The consent of Congress is hereby given to the coastal States to negotiate and enter into compacts providing for the location of mutual boundaries on the outer Continental Shelf. Whenever two or more States are about to enter into such negotiations, they shall notify the President of their intentions, and the President shall appoint a person with suitable qualifications, whose duty it shall be to participate in said negotiations as the representative of the United States and to make a report to Congress of the proceedings and of any compact entered into. No such compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of the States which are parties thereto and approved by the Congress of the United States: *Provided*, That the validity of a State's extension of its seaward boundary shall not be dependent upon the approval of any such compact.

(d) The consent of Congress under subsection (a) of this section to the extension of the seaward boundary of any coastal State is given upon condition that no laws of such State heretofore or hereafter enacted for the principal purpose of raising revenue shall apply to the area added to the territory of such State by such extension, except as provided herein or hereafter.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be interpreted so as to deprive the Federal Government of its proprietary rights on the outer Continental Shelf.

And on page 10, beginning with line 19, to strike out all through line 24 on page 13.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this amendment provides for the administration of the Continental Shelf in pursuance of the traditional concept of State and Federal Government. The amendment would extend the boundaries of the United States and the boundaries of the coastal States to include the seabed and subsoil of the outer Continental Shelf. The amendment does not give the States any revenue whatsoever; it reserves that question without prejudice. However, it does provide that the form of government under which all of us have lived for our entire lifetime would apply to the seabed, the subsoil, and all structures erected upon the seabed and subsoil on the outer Continental Shelf.

This amendment is in keeping with the better recognized practice of international law of extending the boundaries of a littoral nation to include the seabed and subsoil of the outer Continental Shelf. Thus far Great Britain and the other nations of the British Empire are among the 18 nations of this world that pursue the concept that a nation should extend its boundary to include the seabed and subsoil on the Continental Shelf without affecting the rights of navigation or fishing in the waters above the seabed.

Thus this amendment does not impair the freedom of the seas. It protects the use of the sea for purposes of navigation and fishing and it respects the character of the waters as high seas. It does not provide any marginal belt around any fixed structures, but merely treats them as a part of this Nation when they are erected upon the subsoil which is here declared to be part of this Nation.

Authorities in international law could see no serious objection to extension of national boundaries to include the seabed and subsoil. Insofar as any foreign nation is concerned, it amounted to a distinction without a difference whether we claimed the seabed and subsoil to be within our boundary or whether we declared the seabed and subsoil to be subject to the jurisdiction and control of the United States.

The representatives of the oil companies stated affirmatively that they preferred that the United States should affirmatively claim title to the seabed and subsoil rather than pursuing the more nebulous concept that this property did not belong to the United States, but rather was subject to its paramount rights.

Mr. Clayton Orn, an able attorney who represented the offshore lessees, stated that any attorney familiar with the

Anglo-Saxon concept of property law would prefer to have a lease on property to which the lessor had title rather than a lease based on some more nebulous concept. Obviously any good attorney would have to take such a position.

The major distinction between the proposal of my amendment and the terms of the bill before the Senate is domestic in character. The testimony of Mr. Jack Tate, who appeared for the Department of State, was to the effect that it was of no concern to a foreign power whether we applied the traditional Federal-State concept of government applicable in the United States of America, or pursued the theory of exclusive Federal powers proposed in the pending bill. Obviously those who have no respect for the right of a State to administer the needs of its people and to regulate the administrative relations among them would be against my amendment, but I submit that those who firmly believe in the American traditions as they apply on the mainland of the United States will find themselves in a very inconsistent position when they vote to exclude the States from exercising the traditional responsibilities that they owe to their citizens.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Addressing myself to the commission of a crime committed in the region where the Senator now seeks to have State jurisdiction, under present laws how would the case be tried?

Mr. LONG. Under the proposal which we have before us?

Mr. McCARRAN. Under the present laws, the case would be tried under maritime law, would it not?

Mr. LONG. If there were some Federal law applicable, the case would be tried under Federal law.

Mr. McCARRAN. In the case of a crime committed on the high seas?

Mr. LONG. Yes. If we could find no Federal law applicable, we would use the law of the abutting States; but there would not be State jurisdiction.

Mr. McCARRAN. If I catch the Senator's point, it is proposed to load upon the adjacent State the expense of taking care of the trial.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yet there is no compensation applicable to that State.

Mr. LONG. That is correct. I submit to the distinguished Senator that so far as the State is concerned, it will be happy to administer its laws for the benefit of its own citizens. Under the amendment I am proposing, the structures erected upon the subsoil would be treated as though they were erected on Federal lands located within the State. The Senator from Nevada is thoroughly familiar with Federal lands in the States, because the Federal Government owns most of the land of the great State of Nevada. When a crime is committed, the local sheriff can arrest the culprit, bring him back to the local district and incarcerate him there, and trial can be had in a State court before a jury of

his peers. Otherwise, it is a matter of exclusive Federal jurisdiction, and it would be necessary to take the culprit to a Federal district court. Likewise, any dispute arising among citizens would have to be settled in a Federal district court.

My amendment respects the rights of the States to agree among themselves to the precise locations of the boundaries between them. It sets up machinery to enable the States to agree upon their boundaries by the usual compacts among States rather than the method proposed in the bill of having the President of the United States attempt to draw lines into the sea without any consultation with the States.

Senators may look at pages 211 through 223 of the hearings to see the manner in which a learned university professor indicated that State boundaries should be extended. Obviously these recommendations are merely suggestive, but they indicate the manner in which the boundaries of coastal States would be enlarged to include the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf. Hereafter when fixed structures are erected in this area, the law of the State would apply upon such fixed structures. Likewise, the conservation regulations and programs of the State would be applicable.

The Federal Government would continue to be the landlord of this submerged land in the same respect that it is today the proprietor of approximately 23 percent of the land within the continental United States. Nevertheless, the States would discharge their responsibilities just as they do with regard to Federal lands lying within their boundaries.

I point out that the Federal Government has found by study after study that it was a wise policy to permit the States to administer conservation practices, and the Government has been extremely well satisfied with the services which States have performed in administering conservation regulations. My amendment permits the Government to avail itself of the services already present which the States are performing in the area.

Again, I stress the fact that this amendment does not provide any revenue for the States. It is merely a proposal to respect the functions of State and local government rather than to progressively limit and destroy them as has too often been the case during recent years.

I prefer that Senators should vote on this amendment without feeling the least commitment—moral, logical, or otherwise—to support any proposal to permit the States to collect or to share any revenue to be realized from the development of this vast area. Senators owe it to themselves to determine whether they wish to uphold the concept of American Government that has made this Nation great.

It is well to note that such a concept has always applied with the marginal belt of the United States, namely, within the 3-mile limit, even before the passage of the so-called quitclaim bill to restore to the States their title to submerged lands within their historic boundaries.

Thus, even before the passage of the Submerged Lands Act of this year, States had always had, and at that time had, the right to regulate the conservation of natural resources and the conduct of their citizens within the 3-mile belt or the 10-mile zone off certain States by virtue of the fact that such property was within their boundaries, although the Federal Government had the paramount rights thereto.

The practical effect of my amendment would be to establish a State-Federal relationship similar to that which existed within the marginal belt insofar as the subsurface, seabed, and structures erected upon the subsurface and the seabed are concerned.

I particularly wish to stress for the information of other Senators that there are more States than Louisiana and Texas here involved. There are 20 States who have a substantial interest in demanding that a policy be adopted consistent with our American form of government. Those States are Alabama, Delaware, Massachusetts, California, Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina, Maine, Maryland, Georgia, New York, Mississippi, Virginia, New Hampshire, Washington, New Jersey, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Louisiana on his remarks and join with him in support of his amendment.

I should like to ask if it is not strange to see the administration advocating the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands, 2,000 miles out in the Pacific Ocean, some of which are nearly a thousand miles apart, and opposing the annexation of this contiguous area of submerged land which adjoins the 21 coastal States?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it is more than I can understand. The administration insists that we include the island of Palmyra within the Territory of Hawaii, although it is a thousand miles away. No one lives on that island. It consists of a few acres, a narrow strip of land. Thousands of little atolls in the Pacific would be regarded as parts of the new State of Hawaii. They extend a thousand miles in the other direction. Respecting the traditional State-Federal relationship of administration, the administration proposes to take into the Territory of Hawaii uninhabited areas which are more than a thousand miles distant, yet in Texas there will be thousands of persons working on structures in the sea who will not have the benefit of State government and State jurisdiction insofar as the States are able to supply services. It is difficult for me to understand the situation.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not true that the United Kingdom, in the case of colonies such as British Honduras, Jamaica, Tobago, and Trinidad has annexed the adjacent continental shelves of those colonies and turned the area over to the colonies for administrative purposes?

Mr. LONG. That is completely correct. Even the administration which sought to deprive the States of their

land within their historic boundaries, namely, the Truman administration, had a spokesman who testified before the committee and consistently stated that the States should have police power in this area, just as I am advocating. It remains for the present administration to send a spokesman for the Department of Justice in the person of Mr. Rankin, who had had no more than 2 months' experience in this field when he came to testify, to hold that there should not be any State police power or any State administration in this area, even so far as the State's own citizens are concerned.

In that respect, the present administration sent spokesmen to the committee to advocate something different, so far as exclusive Federal jurisdiction was concerned, ignoring the various relationships among the people and the interests of the people. They went far beyond anything the Truman administration had ever proposed. In fact, Mr. Perlman, who testified for the Truman administration before our committee last year, and again this year, stated that the States should have police power, as this amendment recommends. He testified last year to the same effect.

Secretary Chapman testified this year, and he also said that the States definitely should have police power in the area of the submerged lands. This amendment would accomplish that objective.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Does not the Senator think the United States Government should apply as much local self-government to this area as the United Kingdom applies to its colonies out in the ocean, and as Pakistan applies to its Provinces?

Does the Senator know that Pakistan, in taking jurisdiction of its Continental Shelf, left with its Provinces the administration and conduct of governmental functions, and gives its Provinces 75 percent of the revenues?

The Senator from Louisiana is not asking for any of the revenues for the coastal States; all he is asking is that the Federal Government give to the sovereign States along the coast the same governmental powers over the area that the United Kingdom and Pakistan have been willing to give to their colonies and Provinces. Is not that correct?

Mr. LONG. The Senator is correct. Eighteen nations agree that the laws of their states shall be extended over the subsurface and seabed. So far as I can determine, all those nations apply the concept which this amendment would apply.

The United States is 1 of 3 nations that apply the concept that paramount rights should be asserted, rather than to bring the land within the boundaries and the government of the States. But even this Nation, up until the present administration took power, always recognized that the States should have police power in these areas.

I believe the amendment is very much in the interest of the Federal Government, of the States, and of the people who work in the area concerned. There-

fore, I hope very much that the Senate will agree to the amendment.

I wish to emphasize that this amendment does not relate to revenue. Mr. Rankin, who testified for the Department of Justice, answered evasively the first three questions I asked him on this subject. I asked him if State courts should not be able to handle disputes between State citizens, or if citizens should not be able to avail themselves of State services. His answers were always evasive. He would always say, in effect, "That does not mean that the States should receive any revenue."

This amendment asks only for State police power. The question of revenue has been submitted by my colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana, in which I joined with him. The Senate voted against us on that issue. Whether the States receive any revenue or not, I submit that they should have concurrent jurisdiction and police power in the area concerned. Therefore, I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, because it is substantially the amendment just offered by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], with some slight changes with respect to a procedure for agreement between States as to the dividing line between areas on the Continental Shelf, and provides for a little more latitude in connection with the right of States to levy a severance tax or a production tax on minerals obtained from the area.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I hope the Senator from Oregon is not confused. I have two amendments at the desk. The amendment under consideration does not provide for revenue in any respect.

Mr. CORDON. Did not the Senator identify his amendment as "6-23-53-E"?

Mr. LONG. No; it is 6-23-53-D.

Mr. CORDON. The amendment designated as 6-23-53-D does not have in it a provision with reference to the right of the abutting States to levy taxes in the area outside of their State boundaries. However, it provides for an extension of States boundaries to the outer Continental Shelf and incorporates the areas of the outer Continental Shelf opposite the States into the coastal States.

Again, that is the heart of the problem before the Senate—one we have discussed over and over again. The issue is simple. Either the outer Continental Shelf is territory where the sole jurisdiction, control, and right to tax in any form is in the United States, or it is not.

I oppose the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Louisiana, has just said, the amendment has the same effect as the one I previously introduced, which was defeated, with one exception: This amendment does not provide for taxing power; it merely extends State laws to the area of the Continental Shelf, so that the adjoining States shall have the right to administer the civil and criminal laws appertaining.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to have the Senator make clear whether in the area involved there are any islands or substantial bodies of land that would thereby come under State control, or whether the amendment would simply apply to employees who might be engaged in working on facilities on the Continental Shelf?

Mr. ELLENDER. There are no islands whatsoever, except those artificially created by the building of derricks or foundations for derricks, living quarters, and the like, and on which substantial numbers of workers would be employed, boarded, and lodged.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I ask further if State jurisdiction, both civil and criminal, is not extended to the workmen when they are actually working beyond the 3-mile limit, or, with respect to Texas or Florida, beyond whatever limit might be established? Under what jurisdiction would they come if this amendment were not agreed to?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is a question I cannot answer. We are here recognizing and literally erecting a new body of land. It is not recognized as territory. It is a body of land, not heretofore claimed by the Federal Government; the land is completely covered by water, but upon it drilling structures—referred to in the bill as "artificial islands"—have been erected in the area adjacent to the Louisiana coastline, and whose number will be substantially increased as mineral developments progress.

As my distinguished colleague may know, resources beneath the subsoil are obtained by the anchoring on the sea bottom, foundations for derricks. These are usually of steel pipe. The base of the foundation may be 40, 50, or 100 feet square. The foundations may protrude above water from 30 to 40 feet. The derricks and living quarters are erected on top of the foundations. Many persons live on one of these rigs and operate the machinery that is utilized in order to explore for oil and other resources.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It is even more important that State law should apply on the artificial islands than on natural islands, because many of the natural islands are not inhabited. Probably there would be as many as 4,000 persons working on rigs out in the sea, and there might be more than that during some periods of time. There may be persons working on a rig 4 or 5 miles south of Grand Isle. The local courts would have jurisdiction. Local officials on Grand Isle would administer the needs of those persons, if my amendment should be agreed to.

On the other hand, if the amendment fails of adoption, with respect to any disputes which may arise or with respect to violations of law, those accused or involved would have to be taken 100 miles away to the Federal district court at New Orleans, La.

Mr. ELLENDER. A while ago I raised the question that such action

would not be in accord with the Constitution. The sixth amendment to the Constitution provides that—

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed—

This area is in no judicial district. It is in territory, as described in the report, wherein the Federal Government has "horizontal jurisdiction," whatever that may mean. I should like to know what it means. This area is not part of any State. It is not part of any created judicial district.

The sixth amendment to the Constitution continues—

which district shall have been previously ascertained by law.

It is my belief—and it has not yet been cogently contradicted—that the islands created by the erection of platforms will form no part of any Federal judicial district within the United States. What the amendment of my distinguished colleague seeks to do is to extend State jurisdiction to such areas, so that both State and Federal laws may apply. No doubt the areas contiguous to Louisiana would be made a part of the western or eastern Federal judicial district of my State.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I notice that in section 4 (c) of the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana it is provided that—

Nothing contained in this section shall be interpreted so as to deprive the Federal Government of its proprietary rights on the outer Continental Shelf.

I take it that the Senator would assure us that there is nothing in this amendment which would either directly or indirectly in any way deprive the Federal Government of any of the revenue it is supposed to get from oil or gas or any other natural resources in the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. ELLENDER. I give the Senator such assurance. There is a provision on page 4 of the bill which would remain in the bill. It reads as follows:

(3) The provisions of this section for adoption of State law as the law of the United States shall never be interpreted as a basis for claiming any interest in or jurisdiction on behalf of any State for any purpose over the seabed and subsoil of the outer Continental Shelf, or the property and natural resources thereof or the revenues therefrom.

That language can be amplified if the Senator is not satisfied with it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I ask the Senator if he does not feel that, at least until the Federal Government adopts some means of determining just what it is going to do about workmen who may be operating in this territory, which at present is an unknown land, this amendment would be a very good way to handle the problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. There can be no doubt about that. Let me point out to my distinguished friend that when the bill was first introduced, it contemplated

having our maritime laws apply. In section 4, the laws applicable to the outer Continental Shelf were to be the same as those which apply to a ship. It was sought to treat the platforms or artificial islands created in the water as ships, thereby applying to those islands the same jurisdiction, so far as Federal laws are concerned, as in the case of ships, so that in the event a crime were committed on one of these artificial islands, the Federal Government would have jurisdiction under our maritime laws. However, in the course of the hearings, and when the bill was redrafted, that approach was discarded. These islands are made subject to our domestic law, to be administered exclusively through the Federal courts, rather than treating them as ships. They are treated just as though they were islands created by nature, insofar as the application of our domestic laws is concerned.

It is my belief that since this bill does not create or extend any judicial districts to include that area, if any crime is committed there and the accused hauled into a Federal district court in Louisiana, Massachusetts, or Pennsylvania—because under this bill he can be taken into court wherever he is apprehended—it would do violence to the sixth amendment to the Constitution, which I read again:

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law.

In this case there is no judicial district. What this amendment does is simply to extend jurisdiction to the coastal States. As I pointed out during the course of this debate, from time immemorial our people have been working on the coast. They have been tried in State courts for violations of State laws. Under the provisions of this bill it would be possible for a Louisiana citizen to commit a crime on one of the derricks, and because the derrick happened to be nearer a judicial district in Texas he would have to be tried in Texas rather than in Louisiana, and be tried in a Federal court to boot.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to ask the Senator about another section of the amendment. I refer to section 4 (c). That provision contemplates that the States will enter into compacts to decide just where the line is to be out in the ocean. I should like to ask either the senior Senator from Louisiana or the junior Senator from Louisiana a question with respect to the intention in connection with section 4 (c) of the amendment. I can conceive that there might be a dispute between two States as to just where the boundary is off the coast. I take it that this provision is included in the amendment so as to allow the States to decide among themselves as to the extension of the line out either 3

miles or 10½ miles, as the case may be. Is that the purpose?

Mr. LONG. That is correct. This amendment would permit the States to agree among themselves on the direction in which the boundary line should be extended. It would empower the President to appoint a person with suitable qualifications to participate in the negotiations between the States as a representative of the United States. I believe the States would agree among themselves on a formula to be used in agreeing upon the extended State boundary lines. As between Louisiana and Texas, in agreeing upon what their boundary line should be, they would undoubtedly wish to know what Mississippi thought. For the most part each State adjoins more than one other State.

I believe my amendment offers a better way to determine upon the line than to have the President determine it without any requirement that he consult or come into agreement with the States.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it would help the bill considerably to have some method of determining the boundaries, as set forth in section 4 (c) of the Senator's amendment. As to the question of jurisdiction, until these questions are later decided and some Federal policy determined, it would seem to me to be commonsense to give the civil and criminal jurisdiction to the States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to have the expression just made by my distinguished friend from Tennessee. The amendment would take nothing from the Federal Government. On the other hand, the bill will impose a great deal of expense on the State of Louisiana and a great deal of work on its courts, because of the workers and their families who will come there. We will have to provide additional schools, and perhaps enlarge the eleemosynary institutions which are maintained by the State.

The amendment which I offered a while ago would have permitted the State to impose a severance tax, so as to take care of such expenses. Under the pending amendment, no tax would be collected, but the State would act at its own expense. The Federal Government would be put to no expense whatever insofar as the trial of cases is concerned in connection with crimes that may be committed on the artificial islands.

Mr. President, under the pending bill, unless the amendment is agreed to, and provided, of course, that an accused person did not invoke the sixth amendment, the District courts would have to try every little misdemeanor that occurred in the area, because section 4 (2) of the bill provides that all such applicable laws—that is, State laws, Federal laws, and rules and regulations that may be made by the Secretary of the Interior—shall be administered and enforced by the appropriate officers and courts of the United States. It excludes the State courts entirely.

Mr. President, as I stated previously, the bill, without the amendment, would do violence, and cause a great deal of injustice, to the people who inhabit those areas off the shores of the coastal States.

I am hopeful the Senate will accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG. [Putting the question.]

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I desire to call up the amendment which is identified as 6-24-53-B.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 17. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or to prescribe any requirements with respect to, any school, or any State educational institution or agency, with respect to which any funds have been or may be made available or expended pursuant to this act, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement or any other action taken under this act, whether by agreement or otherwise, relating to any contribution made under this act to or on behalf of any school, or any State educational institution or agency, or any limitation or provision in any appropriation made pursuant to this act, seek to control in any manner, or prescribe requirements with respect to or authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to direct, supervise, or control in any manner, or prescribe any requirements with respect to, the administration, the personnel, the curriculum, the instruction, the methods of instruction, or the materials of instructions, nor shall any provision of this act be interpreted or construed to imply or require any change in any State constitution prerequisite to any State sharing the benefits of this act.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President the amendment offered by me is the amendment to which attention was drawn during the debate yesterday by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. Actually, as I understand, the amendment was originally written by the Senator from Arkansas. It has twice been approved by the Senate in previous measures passed by the Senate. It attempts to say, as firmly as language can say, that when Federal aid is given to the States for the purpose of education, as proposed in the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], in which he was joined by many other Senators, and which amendment was adopted by the Senate yesterday, such aid shall not be accompanied by dictates to the States with regard to schools or educational institutions, or the curriculum, or anything related to it.

It is designed to assure, as nearly as language can, that the Federal Government will not exercise control over education when it makes contributions to the support of education.

Mr. President, I discussed the amendment last evening with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. He told me he would personally favor the adoption of the amendment. I hope the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who is in charge of the bill, will also make a statement about it.

However, before he makes a statement, perhaps I should yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], who joins me in the presentation of the amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am very happy to join as a cosponsor of the amendment with the Senator from South Dakota. I offered this same amendment yesterday to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota on behalf of himself and Senator HENDRICKSON. It was accepted by him and adopted as an amendment to his amendment. However, the amendment, as amended, was then rejected by the Senate.

I am very happy that the Senator from South Dakota has offered it now as an amendment to the bill. The Senate has twice passed a general Federal aid to education bill during the past 8 or 10 years—I believe the first one was passed in 1944 and the second one in 1949, and the provision of this amendment was section 2 of both of those bills—which was intended to declare, as the able Senator from South Dakota has stated, in words as strong as language will permit, the policy and intent of the Senate, that in enacting a law providing Federal aid to schools it is not the intent of Congress—and certainly not the intent of the Senate—to confer powers upon the Federal Government in any way to control, dominate, or interfere in any way with the educational systems of the several States.

I may say that since we are for the first time in the history of Congress actually impounding a specific revenue, or a source of revenue to this Government, for aid to schools, it is most appropriate that in this legislation the Senate again reiterate that policy by adopting the pending amendment to this bill. Not that any funds are now being distributed, because the formula has not yet been agreed to, but at the very time of impounding the funds and setting aside and directing that certain revenues to become available in the future for this purpose, the Senate should again reiterate this policy, namely, that it is not intended now and that it will not be the policy hereafter, so far as the Senate is concerned, to granting any control, power, or authority to the Federal Government to in any way regulate or interfere with the school systems of the several States of this Nation.

I believe it is a policy provision which we should reiterate and should carry forward whenever we take any step toward the ultimate goal of providing some Federal aid for the schools of this country. I hope the amendment will be accepted and agreed to unanimously, so there will be no mistake as to the sentiment and feeling of this body with reference to preventing any Federal control or the exercise of any Federal authority whatsoever over the public-school systems of the States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me for a moment at this time?

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] that I fully share his feeling

that the policy should be that there should be no Federal control of or Federal interference in any way with the administration of the schools by the States.

This language was first offered as I recall, to the first Federal-aid-to-education bill which the Senate passed providing aid to elementary and secondary schools. The provision was afterward carried in the Taft Federal-aid-to-education bill.

I think all of us are in full accord regarding the purpose and policy declared in the amendment. This language was written having in mind only Federal aid for secondary and elementary schools. The Senator will recall that on yesterday I spoke about the National Science Foundation. It might be that there would be a desire and in the national interest to have some of these funds used for instance through the National Science Foundation. It might be that, with that thought in mind, when the amendment is considered by the conferees, some changes should be made in it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not believe adoption of this amendment would preclude the use of some of these funds for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. I think that is entirely correct. I do not think adoption of the amendment would preclude the use of some of the funds for the National Science Foundation or for a similar agency or a similar purpose, and I do not believe adoption of the amendment would adversely affect the carrying out of the purpose we had in mind in passing the bill establishing the National Science Foundation which provides for the granting of scholarships.

In conference, the conferees will have an opportunity to keep in mind, in connection with the amendment, the work now being done by or through the National Science Foundation or contemplated to be done by or through it. I cite it as one illustration of how the funds under our amendment may be used. And, of course, before the funds can be allocated or distributed, Congress must pass subsequent legislation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota will yield further to me for a moment or two, I should like to say that I recall that this particular provision was unanimously agreed upon on the previous occasions when it was offered; and so far as I know, it has always been the sense of the Senate that this policy should be followed in relation to any proposal or enactment providing Federal aid to education.

Mr. HILL. In other words, when the Federal Aid to Education bills were passed, it was never contemplated that there would be any Federal interference in the administration of the schools.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota for yielding this time to me.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, although this amendment has not had consideration by the committee, it is clearly one step forward toward the imple-

mentation which must be made of the so-called Hill amendment before it can have any effect whatever. So I would have no objection to adoption of the amendment, for consideration by the conferees.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "6-24-53-E."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 30, between lines 6 and 7, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 15. Reimbursement of States for certain expenses: (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to reimburse the States adjacent to the area of the Outer Continental Shelf for expenses incurred by such States in furnishing services of State and local government to (1) individuals who are employed in connection with operations described in section 4 (b) of this act and who reside in such States, (2) families of such individuals, and (3) persons or companies engaged in such operations who establish shore bases and carry on other activities within such States in support of such operations. It is the intent of Congress that legislation providing for such reimbursement shall be enacted as soon as possible after the committee established under subsection (b) of this section has made recommendations required by subsection (b) (2) hereof.

(b) (1) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee"), which shall be composed of 6 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. Any vacancy in the joint committee occurring after all the original appointments are made shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. A majority of the members of the joint committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. However, the joint committee may make its own rules to provide for the number necessary to constitute a quorum of any subcommittee thereof.

(2) The joint committee shall make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining (A) the amount of reimbursement which should be made to such adjacent States in order to carry out the policy established under subsection (a) of this section, and (B) the most practical method of making such reimbursement. Upon completion of its investigation and study, the joint committee shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the President and to the Congress. After the submission of such report, the joint committee shall cease to exist.

(3) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized (A) to hold such hearings; (B) to sit and act at such places and times; (C) to procure such printing and binding; and (D) to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not exceed 40 cents per hundred words.

(4) The joint committee is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions. Such compensation shall not be in excess of the maximum rate payable in the case of employees of standing committees of the Congress.

On page 30, line 7, strike out "Sec. 15." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 16."

On page 30, line 10, strike out "Sec. 16." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 17."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be vacated and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] 45 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

PROPOSED REDUCTION IN DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS—EFFECT ON AIR POWER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I had planned not to speak on the floor of the Senate during this my first year as a Member, but because of recent further reductions, and postponements, in our defense strength, I now desire to discuss the tragic implications of these reductions.

There are two facts which stand out in the testimony about the cuts in airpower.

The first is that budget reduction—money—was the primary consideration, instead of national security.

The second is that the reductions were the decision of the new and inexperienced civilian heads, without the concurrence of a single top military expert.

Mr. President, I now ask the Senate to consider two developments which have changed the world.

The first is the jet engine, and along with it the breaking of the sound barrier, to the point where planes may soon fly at speeds not dreamed of a few years ago.

The second, and by far the more important, is the development of atomic weapons.

Since V-J-Day further development of these two war instruments has been progressing with unprecedented speed, to the point where now the greatest mistake this country could make would be to design its Armed Forces on the basis of the nature of the fighting in World War II—or on that of the local war now being fought in Korea.

At the end of World War II warfare on the ground moved at the pace of a truck, or about 40 miles per hour; on the sea at the pace of a ship or about 30 knots; and in the air at the pace of a

B-17 bomber or about 190 miles per hour.

Today, only 8 years later, warfare on the ground still moves at the 40-mile-per-hour pace of a truck, on the sea at the 30-knot pace of a ship—but in the air it is already moving at the speed of sound, nearly 700 miles per hour—and this pace is steadily increasing.

Prior to the two atomic explosions at the end of World War II, the strongest punch of firepower was around 10 tons of TNT. Today the strongest thrust is millions of tons of TNT; and the firepower of the hydrogen bomb is presumably limitless.

As a result of these two technological revolutions, the United States began the postwar years with virtually no modern airpower. General Spaatz once testified before a congressional committee that because of these conditions, plus the rapid postwar demobilization, he had almost no combat-worthy wings when he was Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

The principal national defense problem facing this country since V-J Day has been effort to keep pace with these changes in the nature of warfare.

We have not kept pace, because while the Air Force and naval air were trying to cope with the speed of sound and the atomic bomb, there has been unprecedented confusion resulting from so much reprogramming; the latter the result of constant budget changes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has referred to General Spaatz, who testified before the Armed Services Committee. I wish to pay my respects to the distinguished Senator from Missouri who testified that we should not reduce the number of wings needed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Under the plans of the previous administration, adequate air defense, based on that minimum stated as necessary by the Joint Chiefs in 1951, and restated in March 1953, would not have been in being until 1956.

But under the plans of the present administration, there is now no date in the foreseeable future when the United States will have reasonable security against atomic attack by the great and growing Soviet Air Force and submarine fleet.

Incidentally, in recent days Captain Rickover, our greatest expert in the construction of nuclear-powered submarines, has testified before a Senate committee that six of the Russian new-type snorkel submarines would be sufficient to destroy all merchant shipping in the Atlantic.

How many of this type submarines our authorities estimate they now have is a classified matter, but the figure is many, many times six.

This is why it is misleading to assert that current budgetary action with respect to the Air Force does not cut any part of existing or future United States combat airpower.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri, my distinguished colleague, yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to add my thanks to the Senator from Missouri for drawing upon his vast experience and his great talents to give us this very fine presentation today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Missouri has expired.

During the delivery of Mr. SYMINGTON's speech,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment and call up instead my amendment designated "6-24-53-E." I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

I withdraw the previous amendment for two reasons: First, there are three Senators who are in support of the amendment who at the present time are at the White House. They will return shortly. The second reason I withdraw it is that I know that Senators present are intensely interested in the speech of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, which was interrupted by the expiration of his time under the unanimous-consent agreement. I know that Senators very much desire to hear the Senator from Missouri through, and I hope the Chair will recognize him in order that he may continue his speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. LONG. I now offer the amendment to which I have referred, designated "6-24-53-E."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana asks unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment was, on page 30, between lines 6 and 7, to insert the following:

Sec. 15. Reimbursement of States for certain expenses: (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to reimburse the States adjacent to the area of the outer Continental Shelf for expenses incurred by such States in furnishing services of State and local government to (1) individuals who are employed in connection with operations described in section 4 (b) of this act and who reside in such States, (2) families of such individuals, and (3) persons or companies engaged in such operations who establish shore bases and carry on other activities within such States in support of such operations. It is the intent of Congress that legislation providing for such reimbursement shall be enacted as soon as possible after the committee established under subsection (b) of this section has made recommendations required by subsection (b) (2) hereof.

(b) (1) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee"), which shall be composed of six Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. Any vacancy in the joint committee occurring after all the original appointments are

made shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. A majority of the members of the joint committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. However, the joint committee may make its own rules to provide for the number necessary to constitute a quorum of any subcommittee thereof.

(2) The joint committee shall make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining (A) the amount of reimbursement which should be made to such adjacent States in order to carry out the policy established under subsection (a) of this section, and (B) the most practical method of making such reimbursement. Upon completion of its investigation and study, the joint committee shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the President and to the Congress. After the submission of such report, the joint committee shall cease to exist.

(3) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized (A) to hold such hearings; (B) to sit and act at such places and times; (C) to procure such printing and binding; and (D) to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not exceed 40 cents per hundred words.

(4) The joint committee is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions. Such compensation shall not be in excess of the maximum rate payable in the case of employees of standing committees of the Congress.

On page 30, line 7, strike out "Sec. 15." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 16."

On page 30, line 10, strike out "Sec. 16." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 17."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Does the Senator from Missouri desire recognition?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 20 minutes.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1901) to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, numbered "6-24-53-E."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to speak indirectly on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, provided I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from

Michigan may yield to me, without losing the floor, in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I do not wish the time required for the calling of the roll to be taken out of the 20 minutes available to me. I ask unanimous consent that the time required for the calling of the roll be charged to general overhead. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan that the time required for the calling of the roll not be charged to either side? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that the order for the calling of the roll be rescinded, and that my suggestion of the absence of a quorum may be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, numbered "6-24-53-E."

The Senator from Michigan has been recognized for 20 minutes.

ACTION OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD TO EXPAND BANK LOANS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me at this time?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield, provided that I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, because of the important action taken yesterday by the Federal Reserve Board, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a dispatch on this subject by the Associated Press. The dispatch also contains a statement by the Secretary of the Treasury himself, in commenting upon this important action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire whether the article is very brief.

Mr. BUSH. I exhibit it to the Senator from North Dakota; I do not know whether the article would be considered short or long. I do not think it is long for the RECORD.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have no objection. However, cannot the article be read by the clerk? I understand from the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that this matter is very important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for that purpose? The time required will be taken out of the time available to him.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I decline to yield if the time required is to be

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I wish to withdraw that amendment and to call up, instead, my amendment designated "6-24-53-E."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has previously been offered. It is in order.

Mr. LONG. This amendment was offered previously, and I withdrew it because at that time certain Senators who were interested in the amendment were not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed at this point in the Record.

Mr. LONG's amendment was, on page 20, between lines 6 and 7, to insert the following:

Sec. 15. Reimbursement of States for certain expenses: (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to reimburse the States adjacent to the area of the outer Continental Shelf for expenses incurred by such States in furnishing services of State and local government to (1) individuals who are employed in connection with operations described in section 4 (b) of this act and who reside in such States, (2) families of such individuals, and (3) persons or companies engaged in such operations who establish shore bases and carry on other activities within such States in support of such operations. It is the intent of Congress that legislation providing for such reimbursement shall be enacted as soon as possible after the committee established under subsection (b) of this section has made recommendations required by subsection (b) (2) hereof.

(b) (1) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee), which shall be composed of six Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. Any vacancy in the joint committee occurring after all the original appointments are made shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. A majority of the members of the joint committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. However, the joint committee may make its own rules to provide for the number necessary to constitute a quorum of any subcommittee thereof.

(2) The joint committee shall make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining (A) the amount of reimbursement which should be made to such adjacent States in order to carry out the policy established under subsection (a) of this section, and (B) the most practical method of making such reimbursement. Upon completion of its investigation and study, the joint committee shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the President and to the Congress. After the submission of such report, the joint committee shall cease to exist.

(3) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized (A) to hold such hearings; (B) to sit and act at such places and times; (C) to procure such printing and binding; and (D) to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not exceed 40 cents per hundred words.

(4) The joint committee is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions. Such compensation shall not be in excess of the

maximum rate payable in the case of employees of standing committees of the Congress.

On page 30, line 7, strike out "Sec. 15." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 16."

On page 30, line 10, strike out "Sec. 16." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 17."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this amendment calls for reimbursement of the States for certain services. The Senate has declined, by a voice vote, to permit the States to collect a severance tax in connection with these resources, even though the States provide many services which support the operations on the Continental Shelf. This amendment does not provide any revenue for the States. However, it does recognize the principle that the States do many things to support those operations. For example, they supply services to those who work in this area. They protect the property on shore of all corporations which have shore bases; and, by and large, the record shows that investments in shore bases are far greater than investments in drilling platforms in the sea.

The States provide for the education of all the children of the workers who are employed on the rigs in the sea. Likewise, the States provide hospitalization for the workers, in the event they are injured or taken ill or misfortune befalls them or their families. The States provide the highways which the oil companies use, and those who are familiar with the coastal areas of Louisiana and Texas, where the development will take place, know all too well that the enormous trucks of the oil companies, in moving back and forth across the highways, hauling steel tubing and other equipment used in erecting the platforms in the sea, practically destroy the roads in the coastal and marsh areas. The States must rebuild those roads and provide for their maintenance.

The amendment recognizes the principle that some reimbursement is due the States for the service they perform in support of operations on Federal territory which bring a vast revenue to the Federal Government.

It is only justice, Mr. President. As a matter of fact, the record shows that the interior States, for the same services of Government on all public lands owned by the Federal Government within the States, the States receive 37½ percent of the revenue derived from such lands.

The record also shows that the Federal Government provides some reimbursement where it takes property off the tax rolls.

Only last year the Congress passed a law recognizing the fact that where it had established defense bases and thus created additional educational problems in such areas, some reimbursement should be made to the various communities which must provide for the education of the additional children.

This amendment follows the same principle, but it would apply where the Federal Government receives revenue, rather than areas where the Federal Government spends money. The Federal Government will make a great deal of money out of the operations. It is only fair that in making money the Fed-

eral Government should be willing to recognize the principle that some reimbursement should be paid to the States, in order to compensate them for the additional burdens placed upon the States for the services which the States perform in making possible the realization of the revenue.

I know Senators will agree that any person who develops State lands should pay the Federal Government some taxes, and that if he does not pay the Federal taxes some arrangement should be made whereby he will not be exempt from paying his fair share.

I believe the Federal Government has recognized the principle time and time again, and consistently, that where the States perform services for the Federal Government, or where such services place a burden on the States, some remuneration and some compensation should be paid to the States.

The amendment provides merely a recognition of that principle. It provides further that a joint committee shall be established to make a study of the subject and to recommend to Congress what type of reimbursement should be provided for the services performed by the States.

The States would receive nothing whatever unless Congress saw fit to implement the committee's recommendation by passing subsequent legislation to provide a fair and just remuneration for the services the States perform in making possible the development of the vast resources on the Continental Shelf.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not true that this amendment would merely provide for a study of how much a State should receive in compensation for services rendered on the shore to those engaged in operations on the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. LONG. That is completely correct.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not correct that the House of Representatives, in its bill on the outer Continental Shelf, has provided that the States shall be paid compensation for services actually rendered?

Mr. LONG. That is correct. The House bill makes some provision for it. I believe the House provision, which is not in the Senate bill, is not nearly so good as the proposal now before the Senate, because the House provision contains no requirement for a study. The proposal under consideration provides that there shall be a study made to determine what compensation should be paid to the States. It provides that the study shall include a look at what services the States provide on the shore as well as on the sea.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not correct that in the bill as now written the taxes which the States have been collecting in the past on leases now in existence are turned over to the Federal Government as an additional royalty, and that under the bill, if it is passed in its present form, the Federal Government would be collecting what amounts to State taxes but would not be rendering the

services, because the States would have to continue to render such services?

Mr. LONG. That is correct. The oil companies are now paying severance taxes to the States on leases beyond the States' historic boundaries, and those taxes are justified on the basis that the companies receive the benefit of the States' services on the shore. If the bill passes without an arrangement such as I am recommending in the amendment, there will be no way for the States to receive reimbursement for the services which they perform.

Mr. President, I shall ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	George	Mansfield
Anderson	Gillette	Martin
Barrett	Gore	Maybank
Beall	Green	McCarran
Bennett	Griswold	McClellan
Bricker	Hayden	Millikin
Bridges	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bush	Hennings	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Neely
Byrd	Hoey	Pastore
Capehart	Holland	Payne
Carlson	Hunt	Purcell
Case	Jackson	Robertson
Chavez	Jenner	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kerr	Sparkman
Douglas	Kilgore	Stennis
Duff	Knowland	Symington
Dworshak	Kuchel	Thye
Eastland	Langer	Watkins
Ellender	Lehman	Welker
Ferguson	Long	Wiley
Flanders	Magnuson	Williams
Frear	Malone	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAPEHART in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], numbered "6-24-53-E."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I strongly hope the Senate will adopt this amendment.

The amendment would do two things: It would recognize the principle that the States which adjoin the comparatively large Federal areas which are to be added to the productive areas of the Nation, will have to bear certain governmental burdens out of proportion to those borne by other States of the Nation. The reason for that is, of course, that the homes of the personnel and the base office operations and all the other domestic and industrial operations, except the actual fixing of the platforms, the conduct of the operations upon those platforms and the communications activities will take place on shore, and will call for the serving of the people there by the ordinary governmental facilities and services by the States and communities.

We do not know whether the cost of those services will be large or small. For that reason, I have been unwilling to go along with the Senators from the two States which are so vitally affected,

either in recognizing their right of taxation or in agreeing that they should be allowed to have a fixed proportion of the revenue, in lieu of taxes, because I think none of us knows at this time what kind of allowance should be made in order to reimburse fairly the States and communities for the expenses they will undergo.

Mr. President, I do not believe I need remind the Senate that throughout the debate on this subject, not just this year, but in every previous year since I have been a Member of the Senate, I have taken the position, to which I still adhere, that the area outside the State lines should be developed by the Federal Government, that the powers of the Federal Government must be exercised there, that a Federal proprietorship should be recognized there, and that the profits accruing from the resources obtained there should be recognized as Federal Government revenue.

I still adhere to that position, and I have adhered to it not only in connection with the passage of the previous measure of this year, which already has become law, but in connection with the consideration of the pending bill which I strongly support. We have insisted that the assets obtained from areas outside State boundaries, and extending out into the Continental Shelf, shall be regarded as purely and wholly Federal assets, and that the profits obtained therefrom shall be regarded as profits belonging to the Federal Government and as revenue of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, at this time we have before us a question of equity. I believe we must treat the Federal Government fairly, and I think we do so throughout this bill, and the States also, except in this one regard, namely, that I think up to this time we have failed to make allowance for the fact that there will be these heavy local expenses incident to providing the daily public services and furnishing the public facilities to the number of persons—and we believe there will be many of them—who will be engaged in the production of the resources from the offshore areas beyond the State boundaries. We do not know how many persons will thus be involved, but we do know that nine-tenths of the total Continental Shelf lies in the new Federal area which we are recognizing under this bill; and we know that the United States Geological Survey, which I believe to be the most authoritative source existing, states that at least five-sixths of the oil and gas resources of the Continental Shelf will be found in this outside area.

The chances are that there will be a great many thousands of people employed as workers out in this newly productive area, which will add much, we think, to the productive strength and the power and wealth of the Nation.

Mr. President, as a question of equity, is it not just and right to recognize that the States bordering upon this area will have peculiar burdens placed upon them, and to set up a study group which will report back to the Congress, so that we shall be able properly to reimburse—not go beyond reimbursement, simply make fair repayment to the States—that which they will have paid out by

way of the expenditure of public money raised from other sources, to supply public services to the personnel whom I have mentioned? We are cutting off their taxing power in this outer area; and, I think, properly so. We do not allow them to tax the plants that will be constructed in these areas. The ad valorem tax potential there will be very great. We do not allow them to levy any production tax or severance tax against the assets that will be produced there; and I think that is right, because I think those assets are Federal assets.

Mr. President, I do not believe that any Senator who looks this matter squarely in the face will come to any other conclusion than that the States bordering upon these great, new Federal areas of wealth production are going to have to pay out considerable sums of money from their tax revenues raised in other directions in order to carry the public expense and to furnish the public services and facilities to the people whom I have in mind.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he has no desire to see any part of this money ever go back to these States, except that which will reimburse them; and he wants the Congress to be the judge of what is fair. But he does not want to see this principle go unrecognized at the time of the passage of this bill, nor to see us fail to set up machinery designed to discover what is the fair measure of reimbursement, in order that fairness and justice may be done when we have the facts before us.

Mr. President, every one of us knows that in regard to this matter we have been proceeding in a field of unique legislation. The able words that have been spoken by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who has so ably led, both in the hearings and in the discussion and analysis of the pending measure on the floor, have made it abundantly clear that we are dealing with something that is unique in the way of public assets and their development; and we have dealt with the question very firmly insofar as preserving and protecting the Federal right is concerned. I am glad we have done so. There were those who, when we were discussing the earlier bill, feared that we who, by a great majority of the Senate, were supporting that bill to protect the maritime States in the ownership of assets within their boundaries, would be found trying to deny the Federal ownership of the outer Continental Shelf and cut off from the Federal proprietorship of that area some valuable interest, or cut down the exclusive Federal control which this pending bill so carefully and so properly recognizes. We have shown very clearly that no such apprehension was justified.

But I do not think that fact should ever so becloud our minds that we should shut our eyes to another fact, namely, that the States are going to have these extra expenses, that there are ample precedents under which the Federal Government is reimbursing States which have unusual expenses because of their rendition of services to Federal employees and to Federal activities, and that we should recognize the principle that we here have another such case, in a little different sort of field, and that

we should set up a study group or body to make a report to us as to what is the fair measure of reimbursement.

Mr. President, I personally think we are, many of us, prone to forget that while there are but two States involved now in this particular problem the problem may soon extend itself; and there is not a person here who lives in a coastal State, I may say, who is not hoping that it will extend itself into his State. It may extend itself into perhaps 21 or 22 States all told, and it will redound greatly to the protection of the people of those States and to the doing of justice and fairness on the part of the Federal Government to those States, few or many, that may eventually become involved in this problem, to have the search immediately under way for a fair program to determine how this problem of reimbursement can best be handled.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to ask the Senator to answer a question on the basis of policy. I could agree that the matter which the Senator presents and which is implicit in the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana ought to be the subject of study by appropriate committees of the two Houses of Congress. I, for one, if I continue to serve on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, shall be most interested in requiring into whatever additional impact upon the services which the abutting States would provide could be measured. But I want to ask the Senator what comment could he make concerning the policy of writing into legislation a suggestion such as that which is part of the amendment now before us? In other words, what precedents have been established in our legislative history to indicate that committees may be set up as a part of substantive legislation? Would we not be embarking upon something about which we have no prior knowledge?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would say to the Senator, certainly there is no objection, at least in my opinion, to the setting up of a study group. My recollection is that in connection with the Marshall plan, in connection with the antisubversive bill, and in connection with the so-called McCarran Immigration Act, and perhaps other acts, we have done something of that sort. I believe a precedent is also to be found in the Taft-Hartley Act. One of the Senators sitting on this side of the aisle has suggested this, and I believe he is correct. Certainly we are never going to be able to escape certain kinds of legislation in which we realize that our field of knowledge is necessarily limited, and in which we require more information before we can work out the details. I think this is a perfect case of that kind, because nobody knows how much of the five-sixths of the oil which is stated to be outside the State boundaries, five-sixths of that which lies in the whole Continental Shelf, we are going to be able to produce. No one knows what will be

the number of individuals who will be used in that great effort. No one knows what burdens will be thrown upon the communities along shore. But we know they are going to be rather heavy burdens. I want to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from California to the fact that there are two belts involved here, the belt within State boundaries, going out generally 3 sea miles, and the belt going out from the State boundaries to the Continental Shelf. As to the belt within State boundaries, there will be a certain number of persons working. Their families will be living on shore. The States, as to those, however, will be more than able to carry the expenses; and we think it will be not only easy for them to do so, but we believe their participation there should be profitable, because they are going to have not only the rentals, not only the bonuses, not only the royalties; but they are also going to have the severance tax, and, in some instances, no doubt, they will also have ad valorem taxes upon the expensive platforms and equipment which will be placed within that area.

But the chances are that a very much greater group of persons will be involved in the development of the outer belt, so that we shall find, once we recognize this principle which I think is very clear, the States protected in the financing of the activities of that outer group who are engaged in exactly the same work. These two groups of persons will be working in adjoining fields.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. May I inquire whether the text of the amendment now before us provides that the Interior Committee of each House shall be the group that will establish a study?

Mr. HOLLAND. The amendment before us provides that 6 Members of the Senate and 6 Members of the House shall constitute a joint commission which will be given ample power and personnel to study the question, because the question is peculiarly a joint one. I would say that I would expect the appointing power, both here and in the House, certainly to give first recognition to the members of the Interior Committees; but there may be other committees which may very properly be given recognition. For instance, the Appropriations Committee might have personnel on the joint commission, and the committee on Government operations might want to have some representation on that commission. It is a peculiarly difficult question of Federal-State relations and of policy to be followed as we produce these important new resources which have been made available more by the initiative of the adjoining States than from any other source.

It seems a pity to think about passing a bill which, while it recognizes the dominant Federal interest, as I believe it should, nevertheless does not allow for such an obvious fact as that the States will have to serve and furnish facilities to the personnel involved, and to their families. Surely, Mr. President, when we are doing so many things in the field of defense, not only defense production but

in connection with military installations, and in forests, national parks, and the like; when we are doing things that help to contribute to the revenue of the local communities so they can be reimbursed in whole or in part for their government expenses, surely it is not a new idea to recognize that the same principle will have to apply here and that we should establish machinery to discover a fair rule and standard under which we can reimburse the States and the local communities for their expenses.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Without the provision as suggested by the proposed amendment, does the Senator feel that we would get the experience, anyhow, and that in the course of time legislation would naturally come from that experience?

Mr. HOLLAND. That would be quite possible. I would say that that experience would certainly be acquired. Whether it would be as soon or as clearly available to the Congress is another question. But we would have failed to recognize what I think is a very clear principle involved, that these people have got to live somewhere. They are not going to live out on the platforms and have schools and hospitals there, at a distance up to 120 miles out from the shore. The families will be on the shore. There is a stronger case for helping to carry the expenses of local governments than there is in many cases where we now help, as in the case of allowing a large portion of the revenue from the national forests to go to the communities involved.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the Senator realizes that there has been some effort to try to get the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to study the question. The Governor of the State offered to arrange for the expenses of the committee to come down and look at the operation, but Senators were too busy. Senators have been too busy with the pressure of legislation in connection with the statehood bills to go and take a look at Hawaii when a motion was made that we have a look at that situation. This provision would make it possible for both Houses to appoint representatives to look at the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this is our third attempt to try to obtain recognition of an reimbursement for some of the costs and hardships that will be imposed on the people of the coastal States. The first effort was an amendment which I proposed, wherein I attempted to obtain the consent of Congress to permit the States to impose a severance tax to take care of the situation. That proposal failed.

The next attempt was an amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, which sought to extend State laws to

these newly found lands. That also failed.

The pending amendment does not authorize the payment of any money to the States, but simply calls for a study to be made of what the expenses are, and a report on that study to the Congress.

The sole purpose of this amendment is to discover, to what extent, the development of the Federal submerged lands is affecting the governmental economy of an abutting State. It authorizes the appointment of a congressional committee to study the problem, to ascertain if any hardship is being worked on the taxpayers of the coastal States, and if such is found, to recommend ways and means of compensating the State governments for the attendant expenses. This amendment would authorize the expenditure of no money; it would grant not one single cent of Federal funds to any State whatsoever. It, rather, represents a reasonable and just attempt to work equity between the Federal and State governments. I ask the Senate to consider what the pending amendment embodies. Briefly, it states that if any expenses are incurred by coastal States in furnishing services of State and local governments to persons residing in the respective States by virtue of their employment on the submerged Federal lands then—and only then—it is the policy of the United States to reimburse the adjacent States. I ask Senators: Is this not reasonable? Is this not sensible? Is this not equitable? And, lastly, is this not necessary? I do not see how any reasonable person could possibly object to a congressional policy directly solely towards preventing the working of a hardship on one particular segment of our population.

Not a dollar would be expended until after the commission makes its study, reports to the Congress, and the Congress passes upon the recommendations submitted.

I hope Senators will vote for this amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have approximately 20 minutes left. If the pending amendment be adopted, the good faith of the Congress of the United States will be pledged to "reimburse the States adjacent to the area of the outer Continental Shelf for expenses incurred by such States in furnishing services of State and local government to (1) individuals who are employed in connection with operations described in section 4 (b) of this act and who reside in such States, (2) families of such individuals, and (3) persons or companies engaged in such operations who establish shore bases and carry on other activities within such States in support of such operations."

Mr. President, I was one of those who stood foursquare through the years for the basic proposition that submerged lands within the boundaries of the maritime and Great Lakes States should belong to those States. As acting chairman of the Senate Interim Committee, I reported a measure for that purpose on behalf of the committee this year, and that measure has been passed and signed into law as Public Law 31. Under that measure, the right, title, and ownership

of the maritime States to all the natural resources within their seaward boundaries was "recognized, confirmed, established, vested in, and assigned to" the several States. This action by the Congress of the United States was one of simple equity, in the opinion of the Senator from Oregon.

AREAS BEYOND STATE BOUNDARIES

However, Mr. President, there comes a time when we must stop and take a look. So when the call comes to go beyond those submerged lands within State boundaries into the area outside of those States and make a payment, then, in my opinion, the time has come to take the long look.

It has been said that there will be many services performed for the people who work on the structures in the outer Continental Shelf, and that those services are governmental services performed by the States. There will be such services performed, but, Mr. President, most of the dollars these workers will receive as wages—and those wages will be high—will be spent in abutting coastal States where most of them will live and maintain their families. They will buy food and clothing there; pay for medical and legal services; go to local theaters and restaurants; buy automobiles and gasoline. On much of these goods and services they will pay direct taxes. All of their expenditures will increase the prosperity of the community and the State.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATES' PROSPERITY

Many of the workers engaged in offshore operations will own their own homes in the abutting States. They will do everything other citizens of the State do there; they will pay their taxes there.

The companies holding the leases will have to build and maintain very substantial shore installations within the abutting States, and such shore installations will be subject to local taxes. If a State does not have a system of taxation by which the capital investment within the State can be reached, certainly it can provide such a system. This is the ordinary ad valorem tax system that is in operation in virtually all States of the Union, so far as I am advised.

The corporations holding leases will be spending very substantial sums for equipment and supplies in the nearby coastal States. I estimate that 80 cents out of every dollar of overhead expended in operations on the Continental Shelf will be spent in the adjoining States.

If the principle set forth in the amendment is to be adopted, then let the same principle be carried throughout the Federal code. Where is there any difference between reimbursing a State for services to its citizens who happen to be working outside its borders, and reimbursing a State for services to families of its citizens who serve on board our merchant vessels? Is there any difference? Where can it be found?

Yet every maritime State seeks to build up the merchant marine, because it represents a very definite economic asset to the State. When the commercial life of a State is built up, the prosperity of the State increases. The more employment, the greater the tax revenues.

COMPARISON WITH FEDERAL AREAS WITHIN STATE

A comparison has been made between the area on the outer Continental Shelf and federally owned lands within States. The difference lies in the fact that the area of the Continental Shelf is not within States; it is an area outside the States. It is an area subject to the jurisdiction and control of the United States of America.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I have only a few minutes. I hope the Senator from Louisiana will allow me to finish. Then if I have any time remaining, I shall be happy to yield to him.

The propounding of this amendment is simply chapter III in the attempt of the States along the gulf to get some portion of the receipts from the areas outside of their boundaries. Call them reimbursements; call them local taxes or call them severance taxes, or what have you; what is desired is some portion of the receipts from Federal resources in the area outside those States.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, if I did not stand on my feet and oppose this amendment, I would feel I was guilty of bad faith to the United States Senate. I do not believe there is a Senator who did not understand, when we passed the submerged lands bill, that we were excluding from its operation any interest on the part of those States in an area outside their boundaries. I intend to stand unequivocally upon that principle as it was enunciated here, at least by the acting chairman of the committee, when the submerged lands bill, Senate Joint Resolution 13, was before the Senate.

POSITION OF THE PRESIDENT

I am speaking for the President of the United States when I say he is in opposition to the diversion of any money whatsoever derived from Federal resources on the outer Continental Shelf to the abutting States, just as strongly as he was in favor of the principles of the Submerged Lands Act.

Mr. President, if I have any time remaining, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Oregon of the opinion that the only reason why his State receives 37½ percent of all the revenues from minerals produced on federally-owned land is by virtue of the fact that that land is situated within the boundaries of his State, or is he of the opinion that it is by virtue of the services provided by his State, such as police power and other activities related to the operation of that land?

Mr. CORDON. The State of the senator Senator from Oregon does not receive 37½ percent of the revenues from minerals, because there are no minerals in Oregon royalties of that kind are received. The minerals in my State are those which any individual can go out and mine for himself. There is no tax on them.

However, with respect to the States which do receive such a percentage of income, the only basis for it is that those States have reserved from private ownership vast areas of public domain. The

Senator's State of Louisiana and all the eastern States, on the other hand, derive the full value from all land and natural resources within their boundaries.

STATES SHARE REVENUES FROM LANDS WITHIN BOUNDARIES

The State of the Senator from Oregon has 52 percent of its total area withheld by the Government of the United States. That is one reason why Oregon might expect some small share in the revenues from those Federal lands within its boundaries. Under those circumstances, 37½ percent would be little enough. But the 37½ percent received by the States from revenues from those areas is paid because the areas are within the State.

Mr. LONG. I am certain that the Senator from Oregon intends to be accurate. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that in the State of Louisiana there are vast Federal holdings, such as Kisatchie National Forest? Yet of the revenues from oil, gas, and timber, 25 percent goes to the State.

Mr. CORDON. I assume the Senator is also aware of the fact that there would not be one acre of that land in a national forest had not the State of Louisiana consented to its acquisition by the Federal government. In the case of Oregon, that State had not a word to say. Oregon would like to have its public lands, but it does not get them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield if I have time.

Mr. AIKEN. If Congress should approve the pending amendment, is there any reason why the Federal Government should not also assume responsibility for the families of men who leave the many ports of the United States in the fishing fleets?

Mr. CORDON. That is exactly the point I suggested with respect to sailors in the merchant fleet.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not the same principle apply so long as the home base was on land, and the work was on water?

Mr. CORDON. It would seem to me that exactly the same principle would be involved.

Mr. President, I regret to have to oppose the amendment, but it seems to me to be diametrically opposed to the whole philosophy of the legislation that has been presented, and also to the declaration that appears in one of the final paragraphs, section 9, of the Submerged Lands Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] designated "6-24-53-E." On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Sen-

ator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 61, as follows:

YEAS—18

Byrd	Holland	Maybank
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	McCarran
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	McClellan
Ellender	Kerr	Russell
George	Long	Smathers
Hoey	Malone	Stennis

NAYS—61

Aiken	Frear	Martin
Anderson	Gillette	Millikin
Barrett	Green	Monroney
Beall	Griswold	Mundt
Bennett	Hayden	Murray
Bricker	Hendrickson	Neely
Bridges	Hennings	Pastore
Bush	Hickenlooper	Payne
Butler, Md.	Hill	Purtell
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Saltonstall
Capehart	Jackson	Schoepfel
Carlson	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Clements	Kefauver	Symington
Cooper	Kilgore	Thye
Cordon	Knowland	Watkins
Dirksen	Kuchel	Welker
Douglas	Langer	Williams
Duff	Lehman	Young
Dworschak	Magnuson	
Ferguson	Mansfield	

NOT VOTING—17

Chavez	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Kennedy	Smith, N. C.
Fulbright	McCarthy	Taft
Goldwater	Morse	Tobey
Gore	Potter	Wiley
Humphrey	Robertson	

So Mr. LONG's amendment designated "6-24-53-E" was rejected.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, line 25, after the word "bid", it is proposed to insert the words "by sealed bids".

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to require that bids for sulfur leases be on a sealed-bid basis the same as required for bids for oil and gas leases. Mr. President, I wish now to speak for a few moments on the royalty provisions for sulfur development.

I am very much concerned about the provision on page 24 for a minimum royalty of 10 percent on sulfur leases. My information is that it would be impossible for any operator on the outer Continental Shelf to carry on sulfur operations and pay a minimum royalty of 10 percent.

Sulfur is an indispensable and a vital material for our national security. Before World War II we had a tremendous surplus of sulfur, but since then it has become increasingly scarce in our economy. New chemical discoveries have resulted in a terrific increase in the demand for sulfur. Our farmers need it for fertilizers. We must have it for newsprint, tires, oil refining, in steel manufacturing, and in the making of munitions.

About 90 percent of all the sulfur in the world is produced from shallow domes on the coastal plains of Texas and Louisiana of from 200 to 2,000 acres. The average size of a dome is 1,000 acres.

In order to develop the domes in that area it is necessary to drill about 20 wells around the perimeter of the dome, which is in the nature of an inverted saucer, and it costs about \$500,000 to prove whether a structure is commercially feasible. It is not a small operation to prove or disprove a producing and feasible dome.

When one goes out on the Continental Shelf it costs about 5 times as much to prove the feasibility of a dome. So it will cost in the neighborhood of \$2½ million to prove whether a structure is going to be commercially feasible.

It seems to me that a royalty of 10 percent, which is twice the flat royalty in my State for sulfur operations, or 3 times the rate which the State of Louisiana is collecting for some of its sulfur leases at the present time, or about 2½ times the rate paid to private owners in that area, will make it almost impossible to get any production or any sulfur development on the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Senator from Wyoming know of any public leases granted by States which provide for a royalty as high as 10 percent?

Mr. BARRETT. I know of none.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I mean where they are getting 10 percent, as distinguished from a figure in a lease.

Mr. BARRETT. I know of none where sulfur is being produced, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I believe in the State of Louisiana there are three operating sulfur leases at the present time in which the royalty is 75 cents a long ton, which, at the present price of sulfur, amounts to a 3-percent royalty.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have received information that although some leases contain a higher figure, there are no producing leases which pay as much as 10 percent in royalty. Does the Senator from Wyoming have any information to the contrary?

Mr. BARRETT. I may say that I do not have any information to the contrary. I believe the Senator from Colorado is exactly correct about the matter and that it will be impossible to obtain operators willing and able to pay a 10-percent royalty.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming permit me, by unanimous consent, to ask a question of the Senators from Texas and Louisiana on that subject?

Mr. BARRETT. I shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] what royalty is paid on sulfur in Louisiana. I refer to the effective royalty. By effective I mean the rate which the State of Louisiana is actually getting from production.

Mr. LONG. I believe some affidavits were put in the RECORD yesterday by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] which detail that information. On actual sulfur production, most of it has had a royalty of 75 cents a long ton, and a long ton sells for about \$26. If the Senator makes the calculation he will find that perhaps about 3 percent is the amount of royalty being received on the leases.

Of course, I want to make it clear that some Louisiana leases do provide for higher sulfur payments, but no sulfur is being produced. In fact, for the most part those are mostly gas leases, in which the person taking the lease seeks the production of oil and gas, and if he produces sulfur—which, of course, he does not produce—he would pay the higher percentage on sulfur. So far as can be determined, no one is paying 10 percent, or anything like 10 percent.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is exactly the distinction I was trying to develop. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Texas the same question?

Mr. BARRETT. I am delighted to yield for that purpose.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am trying to develop what the States actually get in the way of royalty, as distinct from any provisions in leases.

Mr. DANIEL. The Texas statute as to sulfur provides for a royalty of 12½ percent. However, the land commissioner of Texas has given to the committee, at the request of some of the committee members, a statement showing that no leases have been developed and no production has ever been obtained on leases requiring that much royalty. I believe the only production of sulfur on State lands was under a lease calling for something around 6 percent. It is true that at one time oil, gas, and sulfur were leased under the same leases, calling for 12½ percent. At this time in Texas it is required that oil and gas be leased separately from the sulfur. The leases thus far, of course, are for operations on dry land, or under inland waters. Actually, so far as any drilling or produc-

tion in the open sea is concerned, there has been none with respect to sulfur.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would it not be fair to assume that the operation of sulfur wells on the high seas would be a very much more expensive process than on dry land?

Mr. DANIEL. That is evident.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield further?

Mr. BARRETT. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What royalty provision is the Senator from Wyoming proposing?

Mr. BARRETT. I had not offered an amendment to change the royalty, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I brought up the subject for the purpose of calling attention of the committee to this excessive royalty and to request that the committee consider reducing the figure to 5 percent when the bill is in conference. The House provision sets no minimum royalty. It leaves it entirely to the discretion of the Secretary. If the minimum were set at not less than 5 percent the Secretary could get 10 percent or 20 percent if any would be willing to pay such a figure. The question that was raised by the Senator's colloquy with the Senators from Texas and Louisiana makes it clear that the cost of drilling a dome out on the Continental Shelf will be five times as much as drilling on land in Texas and Louisiana.

In addition to that, geologists estimate that only 1 out of every 20 domes that are drilled out in submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf will ever prove commercially feasible, whereas 1 out of 10 domes on land in Texas and Louisiana have proved commercially feasible. That is because the expense of the recovery of the sulfur will be tremendous. They will have to install expensive steam plants in order to heat water up to a temperature of 300 degrees Fahrenheit for pumping into the well for the purpose of melting the sulfur and bringing it out in a liquid solution. After the sulfur is brought up, heated barges will have to be used to convey the sulfur solution to the coast. It is a very expensive operation. It seems to me that it is very unwise to set in the bill a figure for royalty on sulfur much higher than is prevalent where sulfur is produced under far more favorable and less expensive operations on land. The result will be to make it difficult, if not impossible, to develop the sulfur deposits in the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In the opinion of the Senator from Wyoming, would a royalty of 10 percent be a discouraging one, so far as the discovery and production of sulfur are concerned?

Mr. BARRETT. Most assuredly it would be.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the minimum royalty established were less, let us say, than that actually collected by the States of Louisiana and Texas, it would be only a minimum, and could be adjusted upward if experience indicated a need to do so. Is not that correct?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to identify myself with the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that the matter be kept in mind by the conferees and be worked out in conference, if possible.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment stated again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be restated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 23, in line 25, after the word "bid", it is proposed to insert "by sealed bids."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have no particular objection to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming. The question is simply whether the Secretary shall have discretion to offer the lease on an open-auction basis or by sealed bids. Ordinarily I assume a sealed bid might be preferable. It makes no difference to me, and it cannot make very much difference in the bill. Perhaps the approach proposed by the amendment might be a sounder one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment numbered 6-24-53-C, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, between lines 1 and 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

In the enforcement of conservation laws, rules, and regulations the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the conservation agencies of the adjacent States, and, if he deems it advisable, the Secretary is authorized to make use of such State agencies, facilities, and employees as may be made available to him.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, this amendment simply authorizes the Secretary to cooperate with the State conservation officials of the adjacent States. The Secretary will not be required to do anything in that connection; but this amendment will give him authority to cooperate and to use any State facilities which might be made available to him. This could result in saving the United States Government considerable money. It has been estimated that it will cost \$500,000 to duplicate the State conservation agencies, by means of a separate Federal agency.

The Secretary may find it necessary to establish a separate Federal agency. On the other hand, this amendment would permit him to see whether he can cooperate with the State officials, to the extent of using their facilities and employees and thereby integrate the conservation programs of the adjacent State and Federal areas. This will work to the advantage of both governments and will

save both of them from considerable duplication of expenses.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. There would be no particular objection to authorizing cooperation between the Secretary and the conservation agencies of the adjacent States, although I believe such an authorization is unnecessary. In my opinion, the Secretary could cooperate without such an authorization, and would do so; and in the report the committee itself urged such cooperation. However, in addition to such authorization, there is in the amendment the following:

To make use of such State agencies, facilities, and employees as may be made available to him.

Is it contemplated by the Senator from Texas, as the author and sponsor of the amendment, that there will be any reimbursement for any services which might be rendered pursuant to that authorization?

Mr. DANIEL. No, there is not. It seems that the Senate has crossed that bridge, and that, regardless of what the States may do to help the Federal Government in this area, they will not be paid any compensation under this bill.

My amendment simply provides that the States which are willing to cooperate without reimbursement may do so, and that if the Secretary deems it advisable he may take advantage of their services and may cooperate with them.

As the committee pointed out, we must have cooperation if we are to have a conservation system that will be proper for both the State areas and the Federal area.

Mr. CORDON. I am certain that such cooperation is needed and must be had, and I am reasonably certain that it will be had in any event.

If it be understood that this amendment does not contemplate any obligation of a financial nature on the part of the Federal Government in connection with such cooperation or use of the State agencies, I would feel that, although probably the amendment is unnecessary, certainly it will in no wise interfere with proper operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, since the conservation agencies of the individual States are largely in control of the allowable oil runs, I wish to ask if there is any intention, in connection with the amendment, to transfer the Federal allowables to the tideland States, and thereby increase their proportionate share in supplying the United States oil market. Thus, the amendment, if adopted, might offer to the tideland States a greater share of the total allowables than they otherwise would have without cooperation of the State conservation agencies.

Mr. DANIEL. No; not at all. The amendment would not change in any degree whatever the situation which exists today.

Mr. MONRONEY. Do I correctly understand that the amendment does

not mean and could not be construed to mean that any portion of allowable oil runs which might be available to the Federal Government from the offshore area could be diverted to the use and benefit of the tideland States?

Mr. DANIEL. Not at all. There will be a separate set of allowables for the States, as there is today; and then the Federal Government will set up its system of allowables in this area of the Continental Shelf. However, the State and Federal agencies must cooperate in fixing allowables for their respective areas if we are to preserve a real conservation program.

Mr. MONRONEY. I merely wish to clarify that matter, so that the Federal allowables could not be transferred to the adjacent States allowables, thereby depriving the inland States of their share of the national quotas.

Mr. DANIEL. Correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the question asked by the Senator from Oregon clears up this matter completely in my mind. These areas are extensions of the land mass, and the adjoining States have a great knowledge of the porosity of the soil and the nature of the oil development. I think they could be useful.

Inasmuch as the question of expense has been cleared up by the Senator from Oregon, I see no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 5, in line 5, after the words "judicial district", insert the words "of the adjacent State."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the amendment been printed?

Mr. LONG. No, Mr. President; but I offer it at this time, namely, that after the words "judicial district", the words "of the adjacent State" be added, on page 5 of the bill, in line 5.

I shall state the purpose of the amendment. Inasmuch as Congress has decided in favor of exclusive Federal jurisdiction when some case or controversy may arise on the outer Continental Shelf, it should be made clear that the judicial district in which the case will be tried will be the judicial district which would be within the extended State lines, if the lines were to be extended under that section.

In other words, the section provides that when the Federal law is silent, the State law will apply to any case or controversy which may arise, and that the President of the United States may provide for extension of State lines, in order that it may be known what State law would be applicable in these various areas.

This amendment would simply make clear that those cases would be tried within one of the Federal districts within the State within the adjacent State.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I desire to state that I am in agreement with the Senator from Louisiana in connection with this matter; and that the committee, at the time when it authorized the bill to be reported, also authorized the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Louisiana, and the Senator from Oregon, the acting chairman, to work out appropriate language which would do what this amendment will do for insertion in the bill at this point.

So I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have offered a further amendment, which I will not insist upon, since the distinguished acting chairman is opposed to it. It relates to the same section, on page 4, starting with line 18, where I proposed to strike out the words "Except for such matters as are prescribed by law to be within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States Customs Court and the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals." It is my impression that those words are unnecessary.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. That particular language was placed in the bill at the request of the Department of the Treasury, for the purpose of safeguarding the special jurisdiction of the courts named. The Senator from Oregon hopes the Senator from Louisiana will not insist upon his amendment.

Mr. LONG. As I stated, Mr. President, if the Senator feels that that language is necessary, I shall have no objection to it. I therefore withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana withdraws his amendment. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be not read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Texas asking unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the Record, but not read?

Mr. DANIEL. I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On page 17, line 2, after the word "Act", insert a colon and add the following: "Provided, That such sums collected in lieu of State taxes shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury of the United States to be disposed of as the Congress may direct after the Congress has determined if the adjacent States are entitled to receive any portion thereof as compensation for public services rendered on the shore to those engaged in exploring for and developing the natural resources of the outer Continental Shelf."

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the enactment of the pending bill will rank

high among the important events in the history of our Nation. By this act, Congress will add to the territory of the United States an area of approximately 235,892 square miles.

The subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf adjacent to our Nation comprises a land area more than half the size of the Original Thirteen States and almost one-third as large as the Louisiana Purchases.

For many years I have advocated that the Congress should officially extend the jurisdiction of the United States over this vast area of submerged land and that the coastal States should extend their jurisdiction for local purposes. Two of our coastal States led the way in this venture. Long before any official of the United States asserted a claim for the Nation, Louisiana, in 1938, extended its jurisdiction out on the Continental Shelf for a distance of 27 miles. Texas took similar action in 1941, and further extended its jurisdiction to the edge of the shelf in 1945. Both States began to lease and develop the area. Although their title to the land was denied by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1950, it was recognized by the Court that the actions of Louisiana and Texas inured to the benefit of the Nation and strengthened the claim of our Nation to the outer Continental Shelf. With special reference to Louisiana, the Supreme Court said:

Louisiana's enlargement of her boundary emphasizes the strength of the claim of the United States to this part of the ocean and the resources of the soil under that area, including oil. (339 U. S. 699.)

The first assertion of the Nation's rights in the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf was made by Presidential proclamation on September 28, 1945. The President asserted that:

The Government of the United States regards the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf beneath the high seas but contiguous to the coast of the United States as appertaining to the United States, and subject to its jurisdiction and control.

Soon thereafter many other nations began asserting similar claims. These now include Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, colonies of the United Kingdom, various Arab states under the protection of the United Kingdom, and the Union of South Africa.

In view of these actions by leading nations of the world and the acceptance of the Continental Shelf doctrine by the leading authorities and organizations concerned with international law, it is now safe to say that the theory first advanced by two States of the American Union has grown into general acceptance as a principle of international law. The theory is that the Continental Shelf is merely an extension of the land mass of the coastal State or nation; that its usefulness is dependent upon cooperation from the shore; and that these considerations entitle the littoral state or nation to exclusive jurisdiction and control over the area and its resources.

This theory has been approved by the United Nations Commission on International Law and the International Law Association. I had the honor of presenting a paper on the subject and defending the claims of the United States at the meeting of the International Law Association in Copenhagen, Denmark, in 1950.

It should be noted that all of these developments on behalf of the United States and in the councils of international law occurred without any official action by the United States Congress until its enactment this year of Senate Joint Resolution 13—the Submerged Lands Act, Public Law 31, 83d Congress. In section 9 of that act the Congress first confirmed the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf.

Even with all of these developments it has remained for the pending bill to extend territorial jurisdiction over the outer shelf. It is this bill which will first extend the Constitution and laws of the United States and of the adjacent States to the area. It is this bill which will make it clear that the rights of the United States extend to the entire seabed and subsoil of the outer shelf rather than merely to its natural resources.

Heretofore, it has been contended by some that the Presidential proclamation of 1945 was intentionally limited to natural resources, and that the United States has not proceeded as far as the other countries, which annexed the entire subsoil and seabed of their continental shelves. On the other hand, many distinguished writers, including M. W. Mouton, Sir Cecil Hurst, F. A. Vallet, George Cohn, Richard Young, Henry Holland, and L. C. Green, contend that the Presidential proclamation asserted claims tantamount to sovereignty over the entire subsoil and seabed.

Whatever may have been said about the effect of the proclamation, this bill will settle the issue. The words of possible limitation, natural resources, have been dropped in the present draft of S. 1901, and our claims are asserted to the entire subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf. Although the words "sovereignty" and "territory" are not used, there is no question that our assertion of jurisdiction and control will amount to sovereignty over the seabed and subsoil that the area will become territory of the United States. This was conceded in the testimony of the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, Mr. J. Lee Rankin, and the Deputy Legal Adviser of the Department of State, Mr. Jack B. Tate. This is one of the most important features of S. 1901, and it is the approach for which I have contended as the best means of securing our claims against any opposing claims that might be made by other nations.

No other nations have yet opposed the claims of the United States, but there is a small and vocal group of international lawyers who have consistently argued that the outer shelf belongs to the family of nations and that it should be developed and controlled by the United Nations or some other international organization for the benefit of all the na-

tions of the world. This group has not been able to prevail even in this era of internationalism, and the passage of this bill will do much toward lessening the effect of their arguments. This act will place the United States along side the many other nations which have without hesitation included their adjacent seabed and subsoil as "territory." Most of them have employed terms of "sovereignty," "boundaries," or "annexation."

There are many other provisions of S. 1901 which I heartily endorse and approve. For instance, in my opinion, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, under the acting chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, has made a wise decision in applying Federal and State laws to the area the same as they are now applicable to land territory, rather than applying maritime law as was once contemplated. Also, section 6 will render justice and equity to those lessees who purchased leases in good faith from the States and will permit them to continue their operations. Section 8 will permit the Secretary of the Interior to make new leases of oil, gas, and other minerals so that development of essential natural resources may soon proceed in the interest of the Nation.

The amendment just adopted will authorize cooperation with the States in conservation matters. That will help both the Nation and the States.

Because of what this bill will accomplish for our Nation and because of the many days and hours which the junior Senator from Texas has spent in working on various parts of the legislation, I wish it were possible for me to vote for the measure. However, there are certain omissions and basic inadequacies which I cannot approve. These deal primarily with the bill's failure to apply the historic policy of the Nation with reference to our dual system of State and Federal powers of Government. They are inadequacies which I hope will be remedied by future legislation, and for that purpose as well as by way of explanation of my vote against the bill, I refer to them now.

By failing to extend concurrent State jurisdiction for local governmental purposes, the bill (1) disregards the necessity of cooperation from the shore for successful development of the outer shelf, and (2) it fails to compensate the adjacent States for the public services which they render on shore to the companies and individuals engaged in operations on the adjacent outer shelf.

It will be noted that I am referring to services rendered by the States on shore, not on the outer shelf itself. All of the evidence before our committee showed that the outer shelf operations are amphibious in nature. They begin on shore where the companies have their bases and supplies, and where the laborers live and enjoy the police protection and general services of government rendered by the adjacent States. The heavy trucks and other equipment use State highways and roads; the employees' children attend State schools; the products from the outer shelf are piped or barged back to shore where they are stored or trans-

ported in pipelines on State lands or on private property subject to condemnation under State laws. Every State service is rendered to the companies and employees engaged in outer-shelf operations that is rendered to those engaged in drilling on shore, and the States should at least be permitted to continue to receive the taxes levied upon private lessees the same as they have been in the past.

Failure to recognize and provide for cooperation with and concurrent jurisdiction of the States in local matters will not only result in unnecessary expenses and losses on the part of the Federal Government, but it will ignore our basic concept that the jurisdiction of the States should be coextensive with that of the United States on this continent. Indeed, there is considerable doubt that the Nation has the right to extend its jurisdiction over territory adjacent to the States without permitting their concurrent extension of jurisdiction. This was first indicated by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Harcourt v. Gaillard* (12 Wheat. 523 (1827)), in the following words:

There is no territory within the United States that was claimed in any other right than that of some one of the Confederate States; therefore, there could be no acquisition of territory made by the United States, distinguished from, or independent of, some one of the States.

Again the Supreme Court said in *Scott v. Sanford* (19 How. 393, 446 (1856)):

There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish or maintain colonies bordering on the United States or at a distance, to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure; nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way, except by the admission of new States. . . . no power is given to acquire a territory to be held and governed permanently in that character.

With specific reference to submarine areas adjacent to the coastal States, the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, which then included Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Field, said in *Commonwealth v. Manchester* (25 N. E. 113 (1890)):

There is no belt of land under the sea adjacent to the coast which is the property of the United States and not the property of the adjacent States.

In affirming the Manchester case, the Supreme Court of the United States said in *Manchester v. Massachusetts* (139 U. S. 240):

The extent of the territorial jurisdiction of Massachusetts over the sea adjacent to its coast is that of an independent nation; and, except so far as any right of control over this territory has been granted to the United States, this control remains with the State. . . . Within what are generally recognized as the territorial limits of States by the law of nations, a state can define its boundaries on the sea.

Clearly, it would appear from these cases that for State purposes, the coastal States have the right under our dual system of sovereignties to extend their jurisdiction over the seabed and subsoil concurrently with the Federal jurisdiction. This is even more apparent when we look to the basis upon which the Nation claims the right to extend its

jurisdiction over the adjacent seabed and subsoil.

Mr. President, I think it would be of interest to the Members of the Senate who are present to discuss the theory upon which the rights of the Nation are said to rest.

According to the Presidential Proclamation of 1945, the rights of the Nation are said to depend upon the fact that:

The effectiveness of measures to utilize or conserve these resources would be contingent upon cooperation and protection from the shore, since the Continental Shelf may be regarded as an extension of the land mass of the coastal nation and thus naturally appurtenant to it, since these resources frequently form a seaward extension of a pool or deposit lying within the territory.

In other words, because it is adjacent and appurtenant, and because its development requires cooperation from the shore, our Nation is entitled to exclusive jurisdiction rather than sharing it with some foreign nation or with the family of nations. Where do the States come in under our dual system of sovereignties? Certainly, if it is an extension of the continental land mass of the Nation, it is an extension of the land mass of the coastal States.

Cooperation and protection from the shore are furnished by the State governments. The Continental Shelf cannot be an extension of the land mass of our Nation without also being an extension of the land mass of one of the coastal States. It is naturally appurtenant to a coastal State if it is appurtenant to the United States. And, as said in the proclamation, the resources of the outer shelf frequently form a seaward extension of a pool or deposit lying within the historic boundaries of the coastal States. Therefore, every condition which warrants extension of national jurisdiction over the area also warrants extension of State jurisdiction. This is a natural consequence of our dual system of sovereignties. Under our system, there is no need for conflict, because Federal ownership of the land and Federal laws can exist concurrently with State jurisdiction for local purposes the same in this area as in any other area within or contiguous to the States of our Nation.

Lest someone should say that this is an argument for State ownership of the lands of the outer shelf, it should be said that since the Supreme Court decision of 1950 the States have not claimed to own any of the lands beyond their historic seaward boundaries, and their officials have not proposed that this bill or any other bill should award to the States the ownership of any of the property. The Federal Government owns 24 percent of all the land within continental United States, and it is scattered throughout the 48 States. The States exercise their local governmental powers in the area where the land is located without owning the land; they administer their conservation laws, criminal laws, workmen's compensation laws; and they collect occupation taxes from private lessees engaged in producing resources from federally owned lands without interfering in any manner with the Federal ownership or management

of the property. That is the type of jurisdiction which the States are entitled to exercise in the outer shelf. They do not need a share of the proceeds received by the Federal Government from the lands, although such division of proceeds is made on other federally owned lands and should be made here, if the States are permitted to levy their regular occupation taxes to pay for the cooperation and services that they will necessarily render on the shore to those engaged in operations on the outer shelf.

S. 1901 wisely applies State laws in all fields not covered by Federal law, but says that they shall be enforced by Federal officials instead of State officials. Why should this duplication of expense be necessary? For instance, in the field of conservation, as shown by the committee report, page 3, the States have excellent conservation laws and practices, and the evidence shows that State officials and employees can administer conservation on the outer shelf in cooperation with the Federal landlord without any substantial increase in expense to the States. On the other hand, it will cost the Federal Government a minimum of \$500,000 per year to set up a duplicate corps of employees to administer the same conservation laws and regulations in this contiguous area.

Instead of permitting the States to have jurisdiction for the purpose of taxing private lessees engaged in operations on the outer shelf, S. 1901 takes away the State taxes heretofore levied on existing leases and collects the equivalent sum as an added royalty for the Federal Government—section 6 (a) (9), page 16. Will the Federal Government furnish the services for which these taxes have been collected in the past? Certainly not. These taxes have been used for highways and roads, schools, pensions, and other State services which the States will continue to render to outer shelf operators and their employees who live upon and work from the shore.

S. 1901 provides for no taxes or additional royalties in lieu of taxes on future leases. This is a windfall for the oil lessees on the outer shelf. On one side of the line marking the historic seaward boundaries of the States the companies will be paying occupation taxes to the States and on the other side of the line they will be completely free of such payments. Such a situation is of itself unfair to the States and to their lessees, some of whom will be operating in the same field or deposit which is bisected by the historic boundary line between the State and the outer shelf. This field of taxation is one in which the States can obtain their compensation for on-shore services without any cost or loss to the Federal Government.

I hope that as time passes this body will correct the error of omitting concurrent jurisdiction of the States, because it is an omission which will cost the Federal Government as much as it will cost the States.

Even if we disregard the coextensive rights of the States in our system of dual sovereignties and treat the outer shelf as newly acquired territory in the sea adjacent to the States, the historic policy of our Nation is to include it within the

jurisdiction of the adjacent States. This has been done with respect to all islands adjacent to but beyond historic seaward boundaries. The jurisdiction of the original 13 States included all islands within 20 leagues, approximately 66 miles, from shore in the Atlantic Ocean, as provided in the Treaty of Paris. Alabama and Mississippi have jurisdiction over all islands within 6 leagues, approximately 20 miles, from shore in the Gulf of Mexico. California's jurisdiction extends to several islands in the Pacific which are from 20 to 40 miles from shore. Other examples of this historic national policy are as follows:

First. Before admission of the Great Lakes States, the United States had jurisdiction over the beds of the Great Lakes as far as the international boundaries between the United States and Canada. When the Great Lakes States were formed and admitted to the Union, their seaward boundaries did not stop at the 3-mile limit. Instead, the State boundaries were fixed conterminously with the boundaries of the Nation. Thus, we find the boundaries of the State of Michigan running as far as 75 miles into Lake Superior. We find the boundaries of Ohio running as far as 25 miles into Lake Erie and the boundaries of New York running as far as 30 miles into Lake Ontario.

Second. By the Louisiana Purchase the United States acquired all of the Sabine River and Sabine Pass, all the way to the west banks of the river and the pass. When Louisiana was admitted to the Union, its western boundaries were fixed in the middle of the Sabine River and the middle of Sabine Pass. This left the west half of the entire Sabine River and Sabine Pass within the jurisdiction of the United States but not within the boundaries of either Texas or Louisiana. However, on July 5, 1848, the Congress of the United States passed an act which permitted the State of Texas to extend its eastern boundaries to include the west half of the Sabine River and Sabine Pass.

Third. By international agreement with Mexico, the United States acquired certain lands along the Rio Grande which had been cut off from Mexico by evulsive changes in the river. These lands, referred to as "Bancos," were added to the jurisdiction of the United States, but they were not within the boundaries of the State of Texas. Following this Nation's historic policy, the United States Congress on January 27, 1922 (42 Stat. 359), provided that all of such Banco land heretofore or hereafter acquired by the United States lying adjacent to the State of Texas shall become a part of that State and subject to its jurisdiction.

Even now the present administration is advocating the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands as a State. It seems inconsistent that an administration which proposes to annex islands nearly 2,000 miles from the continent, some of which are 1,000 miles apart, should oppose the annexation of the adjacent outer shelf which is contiguous to our existing coastal States and which forms an extension of their land mass, and the

development of which requires their co-operation from shore.

Other nations which are not as securely wed to local self-government and the dual system of sovereignties have taken advantage of our system in providing for governmental powers in their adjacent continental shelves. For instance, the United Kingdom annexed the continental shelves adjacent to the colonies of Tobago and Trinidad and attached them to those colonies for administrative purposes.

The central government of the United Kingdom allows the colonies to administer their continental shelves. The British Information Office at the Embassy in Washington advises that the local governments of the Bahamas, British Honduras, and Jamaica also administer their adjacent continental shelves and receive the revenues therefrom. Pakistan permits its coastal Provinces to share in the administration and governmental powers over its adjacent continental shelf and gives the Provinces 75 percent of the revenues.

Think of it. Pakistan gives its Provinces governmental powers, instead of having the central government control the continental shelf, and shares with the local Provinces the revenues from the continental shelf.

Today the coastal States of the American Union which pioneered the Continental Shelf doctrine and helped secure this land for the Nation are asking not for as much power or revenue as the United Kingdom gives its colonies, or as Pakistan gives its Provinces. All we ask is that the United States Government continue its system of dual sovereignties by following its historic policy of extending State jurisdiction to adjacent areas whenever Federal jurisdiction is extended.

No one has advanced any good reason why this historic American policy should be abandoned with reference to the outer shelf. The only reason I have heard is that some are afraid that the States will get some of the proceeds. However, throughout the argument, we have said that for the good of the States and the good of the Nation, the States are willing to exercise their governmental functions without any money from the Federal Government if the Congress is determined not to compensate the States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be granted 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] would be willing to yield 3 minutes of his time to the Senator from Texas, rather than have 3 additional minutes granted.

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield 3 minutes or even 4 to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Many witnesses have testified concerning the benefits which will accrue to the Nation, as well as to the States, by application of the policy under which our country has prospered throughout the years.

Mr. President, I am certain that the pending bill will be passed. I approve and support many of its provisions, but because of its failure to preserve and apply the system of Federal-State relations which has been so important and essential to the development and prosperity of our Nation, I am compelled to vote against it.

The House bill, although not meeting all the objections I have raised, does apply State laws and concurrent State jurisdiction. Also, it provides for compensation to the States for services rendered to those engaged in operations on the adjacent outer shelf. It is hoped that the conference committee will agree upon application of the principles and equities which are ignored in S. 1901, so that it will be possible for the junior Senator from Texas to vote for the final enactment of outer-shelf legislation. If not, it is my hope that after a few years of practical operations the omissions and inadequacies which I have mentioned will be corrected in future legislation.

Again I compliment the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the committee for their patient and exhaustive work on the proposed legislation. The fact that I do not concur in some of the omissions is no criticism of them or of the sincerity of their judgment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time remains for discussion of the bill itself?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 87 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from Oregon yield 25 minutes to me? I might be able to make my speech in less time.

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the junior Senator from Louisiana 25 minutes or as much time as he may require.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, today I have offered amendment after amendment to try to perfect the bill, in order to make it the type of legislation I believe the Senate should enact. The major amendments I offered were rejected, and only a few clarifying perfecting amendments were agreed to by the Senate. Therefore, the objections I originally had to the bill still remain.

I am opposed to S. 1901 because in my opinion it does great violence to our traditional concept of dual sovereignty in American government and will, insofar as law and order are concerned, create a virtual dictatorship which will impose its heavy hand at will on the administration of justice to many thousands of American citizens.

The bill, by denying the States any powers of taxation and refusing them

any portion of the revenues which might be derived from the outer Continental Shelf, fails to recognize the tremendous financial burdens which operations in the area will place upon the States concerned.

I also object to the provisions of the bill which provide exclusive Federal administration of the area. Nevertheless, it is fair to observe that the committee amendments in this connection are a vast improvement over the original proposal to apply admiralty and maritime law to structures which are now located in the outer Continental Shelf or may be built there.

While the committee held hearings of considerable length and allowed the presentation of a great deal of evidence from the State officials concerned, I do not believe this bill has received the calm and deliberate consideration which such important legislation deserves. Any act which has as its purpose the establishment of a system of law and a means of administering justice should be considered on a plan free of the ordinary political and economic currents which, unfortunately, are present in the instant case. This is no reflection on the sincerity of the majority of the committee who have done perhaps the best they could under a rigid timetable designed for the purpose of obtaining legislation by a time certain.

Careful delineation must be made between the area with which this bill deals and the area involved in the Submerged Lands Act recently enacted. In the prior legislation, title to the lands within the original boundaries of the States—lands which had been claimed without contest by the States for 150 years—was confirmed in the States. Those lands, until the Supreme Court had applied to them a new concept of paramount rights in the Federal Government, always had been within the limits both of the Nation and of the respective States and had been subject to our traditional concepts of dual sovereignty.

When we look upon the Continental Shelf and the resources thereof in its true light, we do not find it to have been an asset historically possessed by the United States. Rather we find that area to be in a sense a vast new strip of territory of major value which this Nation has the fortunate power to take by virtue of the fact that it was closer than any other power of the world to the area. It is important to note that in acquiring this vast resource, the United States found that the States of Louisiana and Texas had already laid claim upon certain parts of it. These claims on behalf of Louisiana and Texas had certain validity. It gave those States the right to extract resources and retain all revenue derived from them until such time as the Federal Government itself asserted its rights. The effects of the claim of paramount rights to such resources by President Truman in 1945 and the congressional claim this year were not only that of acquiring such resources for the United States but of ousting the States of their interest in this area.

There is no truly analogous situation in property law. Logic and reason, however, would compel the Federal Govern-

ment, in taking such resources from the States, to permit the States to share in the revenues produced in some equitable fashion. Especially is this true when we consider the fact that the Federal Government is receiving the benefit of State services for the support of all activities on shore which are of a large scope and a greater expense than the actual drilling operation in the sea. Thus we find here a source of wealth, first discovered and developed by the States at considerable expense, and which cannot be fully exploited or developed without the benefit of State services from the mainland. Under this bill a few States will bear a heavy financial burden while all the States—most of which will neither contribute to the development nor bear any of the costs—will reap the benefits.

Many thousands of Louisiana and Texas citizens who live under a long established and well understood system of both Federal and State law—enforced as the case might be by both Federal and State officials—under the provisions of this bill, will perform their labors in an area governed by a curious and complex mixture of Federal and State laws, administered only by Federal officials, with power in the Secretary of Interior to abrogate State laws by regulation. A resident of Morgan City, La., who might become a party to litigation arising in the outer Continental Shelf, will bear the expense of having his rights litigated—no matter how insignificant they might be—in a Federal court many miles removed from his domicile, rather than in his nearby parish courthouse. His rights and privileges can vary from day to day at the discretion of a department head at the seat of government in Washington, many hundreds of miles removed from the area. Insofar as the place of his employment is concerned, his rights as an American citizen will be even less secure and certain than those of the people of the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. His suffrage will not provide him the customary relief to be expected under our Constitution and all of the great principles upon which American Government is founded.

Many circumstances point directly to the fact that operations in the outer Continental Shelf will greatly increase the cost of State and local government and yet the committee ignores this fact. The Senate has ignored it, and even defeated a last-resort proposal I offered to reimburse the adjacent States for these services to the extent of a mere one-half of the taxes we now collect in the area.

A typical individual employed in operations in the shelf area will maintain his family in one of our coastal parishes; he will own or be buying his house and an automobile there. His children will attend Louisiana schools. If either he or a member of his family becomes ill, he will be cared for by a Louisiana doctor in a Louisiana hospital, many of which the State owns. After his employment in the shelf ends, he will continue to live in Louisiana and will spend his old age there.

The children of these employees will attend a free public school, and be provided with free schoolbooks, supplies,

lunches, and transportation. Our highways and streets will be traveled by both employer and employee. The State provides charity hospitals for the indigent sick. Care for those stricken with tuberculosis or mental diseases is provided by State-operated hospitals. A State-financed medical school now provides many of the doctors who will minister unto these people. The worker's person and property will be protected by our police. He will be protected from disease and sickness by our public health and sanitation officers. His elderly parents are likely to be receiving a pension during their period of nonproductivity.

Louisiana and Texas provide a system of courts in which the employee will litigate many of his claims.

Many of these same services will be provided for the oil company whose base of operations will be necessarily on Louisiana or Texas soil. The company will use our highways, will benefit from police protection, and make use of our courts.

None can deny that the furnishing of such services to the thousands of shelf workers, their families, and the companies for which they work will be a heavy financial burden on the State and its subdivisions.

Ordinarily a large percentage of the increased cost of providing such service would be met by increasing the taxes on present sources of revenue. Such action would be grossly unfair in this instance. Yet there will be no alternative if the employers of these workers are subject neither to the State's severance tax, property tax, nor the tax on corporate profits. It is a basic principle in the field of government that the provision of government services to the business enterprise and its employees is made possible largely through the taxation of property and profits of such enterprise. Usually no difficulty is encountered in the application of this principle, since the industry and its employees are located in the same State. Usually, we derive our revenues from such industry by virtue of a severance tax on the resources. However, in this instance the industries are beyond the reach of the State.

No oil company holding a lease in the area protested to the committee against paying the severance tax. I have heard of no such protest being made publicly anywhere else by any of the companies. Since the tax is not applicable to the public royalty interest, its collection would in no wise affect the revenues which will be derived by the Federal Government. Its collection could be allowed, therefore, without any cost to the United States. But rather than deal fairly with the States, the Federal Government has chosen, through the "wind-fall" provision in this bill, to extract the last ounce of flesh by adding the amount of the States' tax to the royalty to which the Federal Government is otherwise entitled under the validated States' leases.

The policy of sharing revenues with local units of government is so firmly imbedded in our governmental system that it is shocking even to contemplate that it be ignored here. Not only has

this system been part of the warp and woof of Federal-State relationships for many years, but it has more and more extended itself into State-municipal affairs; in many States, State and Federal Governments have so completely preempted the sources of taxation that only by sharing in certain revenues with the State government are the municipalities able to continue their operation.

Before citing examples of this Federal policy as they are applicable in the instant situation, let me make it perfectly plain that I do not object to any of these devices. Insofar as I can determine, each of them is entirely justified, and the Congress was exercising excellent judgment when it provided for them. What I cannot understand is why, after all these years, the Congress should determine to abandon this historic policy. Why should the States which abut the Continental Shelf be subjected to this discrimination? For what are we being punished? What strained definition of fairness would permit such grave injustice? Certainly the people of Louisiana cannot, and perhaps never will, understand what grievous wrong they have committed which results in their being treated as no other State or Territory has been treated in like circumstances.

Let us first look at what has been done in the great public-lands States of the West. Almost the full income from all these public lands, exceeding 200 million acres, goes to the States in which the lands are located. Where such lands are sold outright, 5 percent of the proceeds of sale goes to the State. The other 95 percent goes into the reclamation fund. Where mineral royalties are realized, 37½ percent of the return goes directly to the State, 52½ percent into the reclamation fund, and 10 percent to the Federal Government as administrative expense.

Thus far, from these sources the reclamation fund has received about \$600 million. This money, quite properly, has been utilized to finance our great reclamation projects, all of which are located in the States from which the bulk of the revenues are derived. The net effect, therefore, is that not only do the State governments receive monetary consideration for the services they must render but almost the full fruits of the resources developed remain in the area from which the resources are taken. These fruits are not distributed to all the States or all the people, nor should they be.

These public lands are not treated thus on the basis of their having been federally acquired and thereby removed from the tax rolls. The idea was and is to make it possible for State and local government to exist. In the absence of such an arrangement, it might have been impossible ever to establish and support States in areas where vast acreages had been unclaimed. In effect, it has been a subsidy, albeit a worthy one. I can well understand the position of some of the Western States that even this arrangement is not responsive to their needs and that they need and are entitled to a greater share of the revenues. I merely observe that it is far

better treatment than is proposed in this bill for the coastal States of the Nation.

In the Southeast there has been over the past 20 years a considerable Federal activity in the form of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Here the treatment rendered to State and local government is perhaps the high-water mark in Federal generosity. During fiscal year 1952 the TVA paid to State and local governments in the area \$3,036,207 as in lieu of tax payments. The manner in which the philosophy of "in lieu" payments has been applied here is extremely interesting.

In this connection it is interesting to note that not only is the State of Tennessee reimbursed for the lands located beneath the reservoirs, which lands have been taken off the tax rolls, but it is also reimbursed for the taxes which were previously received from the corporations which were located within that State and doing business there prior to the time the lands were purchased by the Federal Government. In the first place, there is reimbursement for the reservoir lands which were bought by TVA and thereby removed from local tax rolls. That portion of the payments is commonly understood. But in TVA, the concept has been taken a step farther. There also is reimbursement for taxes lost by virtue of sale because of TVA activities of the private power companies which formerly operated in the area. It should be remembered too, that those receiving the payments also receive the benefits of the enterprise—power and navigation. These benefits are provided by the tax dollars of all the people and the Federal Government, despite the protests of the TVA advocates, will never receive sufficient revenues from the operations to reimburse its cost. It seems to me that it does not become those from the TVA territory—an area which actually is being paid to receive benefits—to array themselves with those who would deny my State even reimbursement for its services in providing revenues to the Federal Treasury, let alone deny us any participation in these revenues because we had the courage to first claim the area, the foresight to develop it, and the patriotism to acquiesce to an overriding Federal claim. Here in TVA we see the bounty of the Federal Government in full flower and at its generous best.

There also is a provision in our flood-control law for reimbursement to local government for tax losses and for additional burden. Although amended several times, the law now provides that 75 percent of revenues derived from leases of reservoir lands shall be returned to the counties in which the lands are located. Just recently—within 10 days—we amended the law to allow these funds to be used for general purposes of government. Prior to that amendment the moneys had to be used for schools and roads. Bearing in mind that the areas in and above a reservoir receive little or no benefit from the project, it may be that this arrangement is not too generous—certainly not as generous as the TVA practice. Nevertheless, it is another illustration of the ad-

herence by Congress to the broad policy of reimbursing the States for any burden placed upon them by a Federal activity.

Over the past four decades the Federal Government has acquired millions of acres of land and placed them in national forests. Particularly in the southeastern States, it has been a meritorious and highly successful program. In my own State of Louisiana there is a fine national forest where our great timber tracts of days gone by are being restored by careful conservation practices. It is a program that is well justified in the public and in the national interest.

These lands, however, have been acquired lands for the most part. Certainly in the southeastern States they are, since there were no public lands to be used for this purpose. This means, then, that the acreages in the forests have been removed from the tax rolls, and therefore produce no revenues for local governmental purposes. Yet persons live in and around the areas, work in them, and must be provided with schools, roads, and other governmental services commonly furnished at the State and local levels. In some parishes of Louisiana nearly one-half the land within the parish is included within the forest. I am sure that the same situation applies in some counties in Mississippi and Arkansas, and perhaps other States.

In 1908, the Congress recognized that local government must have revenues to meet the burdens still imposed upon it and yet was faced with substantial loss of taxable property from which the revenues could be derived. Congress, therefore, by act of May 23 of that year, provided for the counties in which the lands were located to share in the revenues from the national forests. At present, 25 percent of the timber and mineral leasing revenues in the forests are returned to the counties for school and road purposes. Somewhat recent changes in mineral leasing procedures have substantially reduced receipts in some areas, particularly in Louisiana and Mississippi where there has been considerable oil and gas activity so that the present arrangement may not be as good as it should be. But the policy—the historic national policy—has been applied and no doubt could, if necessary, be improved upon in its application. What a contrast with what is proposed in this legislation.

Last, I want to call attention to a field in which this traditional Federal policy has been generously applied even though the Federal activity involved is not producing revenue as will be the Continental Shelf. This has to do with educational activities in areas where substantial Federal activity has increased the burden on local government for provision of school services. I particularly want the Senate to observe the statement of policy contained in the basic act and I then would welcome any Senator rising to his feet and attempting to reconcile this law with what we propose to do here. I do not believe my friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]

with all his mental agility and legal ability can do it.

Now listen to what we said—this Senate and this Congress—when we adopted the present act in 1950. Here it is as found in section 236, title 20, of the United States Code:

In recognition of the responsibility of the United States for the impact which certain Federal activities have on the local educational agencies in the areas in which such activities are carried on, the Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in this chapter) for those local educational agencies upon which the United States has placed financial burdens by reason of the fact that—

1. The revenues available to such agencies from local sources have been reduced as the result of the acquisition of real property by the United States; or
2. Such agencies provide education for children residing on Federal property; or
3. Such agencies provide education for children whose parents are employed on Federal property; or
4. There has been a sudden and substantial increase in school attendance as the result of Federal activities.

At least I am glad it is the law because we in Louisiana and Texas will have substantial claims to make under it. But how much more simple it would be to let us go ahead and collect our taxes and provide the services rather than to do what is now proposed. Bear in mind that there are substantial differences between the property involved here and that at Keesler Field, Miss., as an example. This Federal activity will produce revenue and the cost of the service required should be charged directly against the activity. It could be done readily and cheaply by allowing the States to collect their taxes which could not be done on an airfield or a training base.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon allow me 2 or 3 minutes?

Mr. CORDON. I shall yield the Senator such time as he desires to use, up to 15 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Oregon. Mr. President, first I wish to give high praise to the distinguished Senator from Oregon and to every other Senator who sat so long and under such great difficulties in considering the terms of the pending outer Continental Shelf bill before it was reported to the Senate. I doubt that Senators who did not participate in the consideration of this bill realize the complexity of the subject, or the fact that it involved a completely new problem, raising many questions which had never before been answered in all the history of our Nation, and that such questions had to be answered before the bill could be reported, bringing out constructive legislation which would deal effectively with those questions.

Insofar as it was humanly possible to deal with the vast field involved—much of it is still unknown—by bringing out an original bill which makes a sound beginning and lays a sound foundation

for the development of resources, believed to be immense in their impact upon our Nation, its prosperity and power, the distinguished Senator from Oregon and his associates have rendered a very great service, which will be more and more realized and recognized as years pass and as the development of these great offshore areas proceeds.

Mr. President, I wish to make two points, and those very briefly.

First. The subject is one in which exclusive Federal jurisdiction obtains and in which the jurisdiction of Congress will remain to deal with the numerous aspects of those problems which must come up from time to time and require clarification, or modification, or amendment, or supplementation of the basic law which we are now passing.

It is because of that fact that I believe no Senator who votes for the bill—and I shall not only vote for it but I support it strongly and warmly—needs to feel apprehension because of the fact that there are questions still unexplored and still not wholly clear, such as the one mentioned by some Senators a little while ago, when we felt that a certain amendment might be properly added to the bill.

We do have assurance that the jurisdiction of Congress continues. Its responsibility will continue to exist, not only to work out the great problem in a way which is fair to the Nation, but also in a way which is fair to every State, every community, and every affected citizen and industry.

Secondly, I wish to ask the attention of those Senators who had apprehensions as to what would be the views of those of us who insisted so strongly upon the protection of State's rights, within State boundaries, and insisted that the States be allowed again to claim and clearly hold ownership of assets within their boundaries, as they had believed they had owned such assets for 150 years, and as they had used them and enjoyed them for all that period of time without question. Some of the Senators feared that we who supported the States rights bill, Senate Joint Resolution 13, would be found later opposing a bill which would recognize title in the Federal Government to that greater area, 9 times as great, outside the State boundaries, with assets estimated to be 5 times as great in the outer belt. I call to the attention of the Senators who felt that such apprehension may have been justified, that, not only have Senators, who in committee helped to bring out the other submerged-lands bill, also helped to bring out the pending bill, as well as insisted on its passage on the floor, but that many Senators who do not have the honor of serving on the committee, have taken exactly the same position.

Therefore, it ought to be abundantly clear that Senators who vote to protect their States when they believe the rights of their States are jeopardized, and when sound principles of government are threatened to be upset, also feel just as strongly, and are just as ready to stand for the Federal Government in a field where its interest is predominant, as they have done on this bill.

I hope the cavilling of those ultra-liberal columnists and commentators who threw out repeated warnings to the effect that the Senators who stood for States rights would later, on this issue, seek to take from the Federal Government what belonged to it, has been rather fully answered. We who passed the earlier bill to protect the States, within their boundaries, have given strong support to the pending measure, which is of such great importance to our Nation, not only in the assets which it makes available, but in that it takes a step outside into uncharted depths and uncharted values and uncharted developments, which we think will add much to the power and prestige and wealth of this great Federal Union, which we are sworn to uphold in its own field, just as many of us still feel we are sworn to uphold the rights, powers, and prerogatives of our States in their fields, believing that by so doing we support the dual system of sovereignty under which this Nation has grown great—the system whose collapse would doom much of that greatness to destruction and decay.

I warmly compliment and thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am deeply appreciative of the generous compliments paid to me. I wish to say that this was not a one-man job. It had been a record of cooperation, helpfulness, and hard work on the part of the members of the committee and the Members of the Senate who worked closely with the committee, and an able and devoted staff which worked long days and very often far into the nights.

I am not too proud of what has been born of all these great efforts, but I believe we have set up the means whereby the development of the mineral resources of the outer Continental Shelf can be undertaken. We can correct this measure as deficiencies appear from time to time without the chaos that would exist had we attempted merely to validate the good-faith State-issued leases and authorize new leasing. We have in S. 1091 a legislative structure which will carry our responsibilities to the people and the companies who will perform the work of developing the outer shelf.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. Not at the moment. I should like to conclude my statement.

Some question has been raised as to criminal jurisdiction in the area. I answered an inquiry from the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and I should like now to call his attention and the attention of the other Members of the Senate to a section of the Federal Code pertaining to that subject. As the Members of the Senate know, section 18 of the United States Code—The Criminal Code and Procedure—has been enacted into positive law. Section 3238 of title 18, entitled "Offenses Not Committed in Any District," reads:

The trial of all offenses begun or committed upon the high seas, or elsewhere out of the jurisdiction of any particular State or district, shall be in the district where the offender is found, or into which he is first brought.

Mr. President, for the benefit of any who may be interested in following up this matter, I suggest that attention be given to the annotations found in United States Code annotated, immediately after that section.

The Supreme Court of the United States has construed the section. It appears to the acting chairman of the committee and, I am sure, to others who have investigated the matter, that we are on sound ground so far as the jurisdictional question is concerned.

Mr. CLEMENTS rose.

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Oregon in reference to the fine work the Senate Interior Committee staff has done on this bill.

I also suggest to the Senate that no measure that has been passed by this body has had more faithful leadership or finer leadership than that which has been given to this measure by the acting chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. First, let me say that I have already praised the Senator from Oregon and have expressed my appreciation of the fine work he has done.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Texas has done so too generously.

Mr. DANIEL. I join in the remarks just made by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Oregon please to refer to section 5, on page 10, of the bill. That section is entitled "Administration of Leasing of the Outer Continental Shelf."

Since we have applied State laws in the fields which are not covered by Federal laws or by regulations of the Secretary of the Interior, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon whether he understands that State laws relating to conservation will apply in this area until and unless the Secretary of the Interior writes some rule or regulation to the contrary.

Mr. CORDON. There can be no question about that; the Senator's statement is correct. The language clearly adopts State law as Federal law where it is not inconsistent with existing Federal law or with the rules and regulations of the Secretary of the Interior; and, of necessity, the inconsistency with respect to rules and regulations of the Secretary of the Interior must be in the case of those rules and regulations which it is within the power of the Secretary of the Interior to adopt.

When he has adopted them, those rules and regulations must be inconsistent with or in conflict with the conservation laws of the States, which are then the conservation laws of the United States with respect to that particular area, or else the laws of the States, having been adopted by the United States,

apply to the area. There can be no question about it.

Mr. DANIEL. I am sure the Senator from Oregon realizes why the question has risen. Beginning on line 24, in referring to the powers of the Secretary of the Interior to make rules and regulations, we find the following:

Notwithstanding any other provisions herein, such rules and regulations shall apply to all operations conducted under a lease issued or maintained under the provisions of this act.

I wanted to be sure I understood the matter correctly; and I wish to make it clear, by means of these questions, that the provision I have just quoted does not mean that conservation matters are to be handled exclusively by rules and regulations of the Secretary of the Interior, but that the State laws will be the laws of the United States as to conservation matters, so long as the Secretary of the Interior has not issued rules and regulations which conflict with or are inconsistent with the State laws.

Mr. CORDON. I say to the Senator from Texas that the language of section 4 to which he has referred and the language of section 5, read as *pari materia*, give effect to both; and the effect is as indicated by the Senator from Texas, and as concurred in by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield for a question.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I desire to join my colleagues who, as members of the committee, have observed the outstanding leadership displayed by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] during the consideration of this measure. This was particularly true because during the same period the Senator from Oregon also had the duty of serving as chairman of the appropriations subcommittee dealing with the Interior Department appropriations bill at the time when the hearings on that bill were being held.

I am sure there is full appreciation of the distinguished service rendered by the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am appreciative of the Senator's generous statement.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I discovered, fortunately or unfortunately, rather early in the session that it would be impossible for me, from a physical standpoint, to handle the measure we are passing on today, and also the one on which we debated and adopted last month, that is, the Submerged Lands Act.

So I asked the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] to substitute for me. As a result, he has served as acting chairman of the committee during the time when I was in the Bethesda Hospital and during the time, thereafter, when I have been recuperating.

It would be very unkind on my part if I did not make a public statement of my appreciation of the fine work he has done, at my request, in handling the work of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the last 2 or 3 months.

I hope that from now on I shall be able to relieve him of some of that burden, because, as the Senator from Idaho has just stated, I know of the hard work the Senator from Oregon does as a member of the Appropriations Committee. The committee holds meetings late at night and begins its meetings early in the morning.

I doubt that there is another Senate committee which has done as much hard work as has the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and its staff, under the able leadership of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] as acting chairman.

It has been my pleasure and honor to be a member of that committee from the time when I first came to the Senate in January 1941, back in the days when the committee was known as the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. I have never had more loyalty or better service in any capacity than I have received not only from the acting chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], but also from all other members of the committee on both sides of the aisle and from the committee staff. I think the committee is really one of the best working committees of the Senate, and I am proud of it.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity I have had to work with the Senator from Nebraska on the committee. I wish him to know it was a pleasure to me to render what service I could.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5134, amending the Submerged Lands Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I now move that all after the enacting clause of H. R. 5134 be stricken out, and that in lieu thereof there be substituted the text of Senate bill 1901, as it has been amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on this vote I desire to have the RECORD show that I shall vote "no."

Mr. ELLENDER. I do, too, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 5134) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that on the vote just taken, I voted a loud "no."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that on this vote I also voted "no."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. ANDERSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1901 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as I have indicated, I was necessarily absent yesterday when my amendment to the submerged-lands bill was acted upon. The able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] took over in my behalf, and, of course, in his own behalf as well, as a cosponsor of the amendment. He made a very able presentation of the issues involved in my amendment. I wish to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for the great favor he did the junior Senator from New Jersey.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4828, Calendar 445, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from California. Having been a member of the subcommittee, I may say I know of no amendments of major importance from a dollars-and-cents standpoint that will be proposed to the bill, but there are 3 or 4 Senators who will have something to say regarding certain parts of the language of the report, on the broad general question of power policy, as it relates to this appropriation bill.

I may say to the Senator from California that I realize that he gave notice that he would bring up the Interior appropriation bill following the Continental Shelf bill, but the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Alabama, and myself had been preparing statements we desired to make during the consideration of the bill. Unfortunately, however, rightly or wrongly, we assumed that, the Conti-

mental Shelf bill having been before the Senate so long, consideration of the Interior appropriations bill would not be pressed. We therefore do not have our statements ready at this time. Of course, I can make a statement, but I am wondering whether the Senator from California, in order to save time, might be willing to take up the bill and proceed with the consideration of the committee amendments, reserving the question of final passage of the bill until the Senate meets tomorrow, in order that we may have an opportunity to present briefly our general statements.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Washington that the acting majority leader gave notice several days ago that the Senate would be in session each evening this week. I am trying to get the program of the Senate moved along, in order that it may not be in session during the Fourth of July period, by which I mean not only on the Fourth, but also on Friday, July 3. We shall be unable to reach that goal unless we can make substantial progress.

The acting majority leader was very hopeful that the Senate might proceed with the civil-functions bill today. If we can dispose of both appropriation bills, I would then hope we would not find it necessary to hold a Saturday session. I did not propose that the Senate be held in session beyond 9 o'clock tonight, but I did feel that, under all the circumstances, in order to meet the desires of many Senators who do not care to be faced with the necessity of a Saturday session, by proceeding now we could make what I would hope would be considerable progress on this bill.

I know the distinguished Senator from Washington is well versed in the problems involved, as are the other Senators to whom he has referred. Having a great knowledge of the power problem, and of other problems affected by the bill, I am quite sure the Senator could effectively present his views without a manuscript on the subject.

Under the circumstances, and since I had given notice, I was hopeful we might proceed with the bill.

I may say to the Senator that, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into early today, it was my intention to have a morning hour for the insertion of matters into the Record, and for the introduction of bills, and so forth, with the usual limitation of 2 minutes for speeches. The distinguished Senator from Colorado had a bill he desired to call up merely for the purpose of getting action on an amendment, after which it would resume its place on the calendar. There are several noncontroversial matters I have taken up with the minority leader. There is a housing bill with a June 30 expiration date, the consideration of which I am sure is not likely to require much time, and we would then resume the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill and make as much progress on it as possible this evening.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure I speak for the other Senators I have mentioned when I say that insofar as the Interior Department appropriation bill is

concerned, we could proceed to the consideration of the bill, reserving a short time for us to present our views later. I know of no major amendments, from the standpoint of dollars and cents. If my suggestion should be followed, the Senators would have their statements ready, and it would not take very much time to complete action on the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder whether the Senator would be willing to let us proceed at this time, to see how much progress we can make on the appropriation bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am agreeable to that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the Senator agrees with me that if we could finish with the Interior Department bill and with the civil functions bill, it would not then be necessary to hold a Saturday session; and I should like to accommodate Senators, if it is possible to do so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4828.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4828) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

BROADCASTING OR TELECASTING OF PROFESSIONAL BASEBALL EXHIBITIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Colorado had a bill on the calendar he desired to call up, merely for the purpose of having an amendment considered; after which the bill would be returned to the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1396, calendar No. 389, for the purpose of getting action on the committee amendment, and also of adopting a clarifying amendment which I have offered; and without precluding the offering of any other amendments which Senators may desire to submit at some later time. I would ask that a clean-cut print of the bill be made, after it is amended, for the reason that there is a great deal of misunderstanding in regard to the provisions of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So the record will be straight, I understand the Senator is requesting that the amendments be adopted so that there will be a clean bill, and that the bill then be treated as an

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 5406) to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to acquire title to real property and to provide for the construction of certain public buildings for housing of Federal agencies or departments, including post offices, by executing purchase contracts, and for other purposes, be referred back to the Committee on Public Works.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CIVIL ACTIONS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES FOR RECOVERY OF TAXES

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 252) to permit all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected to be brought in the district courts with right of trial by jury, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KEATING, CRUMPACKER, and WILLIS.

AMENDMENT OF SUBMERGED LANDS ACT

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. GRAHAM, Miss THOMPSON of Michigan, Mr. HILLINGS, Mr. McCULLOCH, Mr. CELLER, Mr. WALTER, and Mr. WILSON of Texas.

OVERSEAS INFORMATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a telegram from the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following

telegram from Lewis K. Gough, national commander of the American Legion:

Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Legion has resolved in its national conventions that best way to win battle for peace is to win struggle for minds of men. We support revitalized independent overseas information campaign, and stand squarely behind President's proposal, Reorganization Plan No. 8. House Appropriations Committee has recommended a drastic cut of more than one-third in President's request for funds for this purpose. The effect of this cut will be approximately a 50-percent reduction after liquidation costs paid. We are convinced this action does not provide sufficient funds. Also believe restrictive personnel limit of two-thirds of those now employed in each unit, is arbitrary limitation defeating purpose of reorganization plan. So Legion urges Congress appropriate enough funds and remove personnel limitation. Since issue of direct interest to Legionnaires, will appreciate your effort to make this program successful.

Obviously they approve very strongly of psychological warfare and wish the funds to continue it.

BIG FOUR CONFERENCE WOULD HELP MALENKOV BUILD PRES-TIGE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with Adlai Stevenson, who said in Berlin a few days ago that he supports the Eisenhower go-slow policy on a four-power conference with the Russians.

Delay might clarify the situation.

Actually the next move is up to Russia. What about free elections in Germany, for example? The Western Powers sent a note to Moscow last September calling for such elections as the basis for Germany's reunification.

Yet Russia has done nothing.

The present conflict going on inside Russia might only be smoothed over by a Big Four meeting at this time. It would tend to give Malenkov the prestige and esteem he needs to hold fast to the power he seized when Stalin died.

There can be no harm in postponing a Big Four meeting for at least 6 months.

TUNA IMPORT QUOTAS

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago at this time, I brought to the attention of the House various documents pertaining to the problem of imports of canned tuna from Japan. In my remarks at that time, I pointed out

that while the continuation of such imports would have serious effects on our domestic tuna industry, the great bulk of which is located in my district and gives employment to many thousands of my constituents, the problem was not insoluble and could be handled in a way that would be reasonably satisfactory to the domestic industry, the Japanese industry, and American consumers.

Unfortunately our Government has not seen fit to attempt to reach such a solution. The Department of State, in whose hands would rest the principal responsibility for negotiating a satisfactory conclusion to the difficulty, has been otherwise so busily engaged that it apparently has had no time to come to a decision on what steps should be taken. Furthermore, I greatly fear that the Department has followed the line of least resistance and has relied on the quota imposed voluntarily by the Japanese Government on exports of canned tuna to ease the pressure on our domestic industry.

The voluntary imposition of a quota was an extremely shrewd move on the part of the Japanese Government. They correctly anticipated the effect of this move on our State Department. Nevertheless, the Japanese were not giving anything away. The quota they established was exactly what they had estimated their total production of canned tuna would be. Then, when they discovered that production during the season exceeded their preseason estimates they increased the quota to a figure again approximately equal to their actual production. They did so, however, without fanfare, without the great publicity attendant on the original announcement of the quota. They made the increase in this fashion because they knew that their later action was a virtual repudiation of their earlier action; that any great publicity would be bound to bring forth vehement protests and possibly action by our Government as the result of these protests to make the quotas a part of our law and thus not susceptible to change at the whim of the Japanese producers, who after all exert a very powerful influence on their Government.

Now the quota period has ended. Indeed, it ended on April 1.

But what has the Japanese Government done since? Has it announced a continuation of the quota system at the same level as last year? No.

Has it announced any quota at all for the fiscal year—Japanese—commencing on April 1? The answer is no.

And since nearly 3½ months have elapsed since April 1, it seems there is small likelihood that any quota will be announced and the Japanese exporters will enjoy unrestricted liberty to steal the markets away from our domestic canners. Our industry predicted a year ago that the quotas imposed voluntarily by the Japanese Government—but with the acquiescence of the Japanese industry—would last only as long as seemed to be necessary to forestall action by the Congress or by the executive branch. The events, or rather lack of events, since April 1 tend to prove that the industry's prediction was true.

tleman spoke quite properly, I think, of the possibility of the ACP program dying of its own weight.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman did not repeat correctly what I did say. I said that the ACP program will die of its own weight unless it has support from the grassroots. That support is assured if the Department will follow the advice and mandate of the conferees contained in this report.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Nevertheless, I would like to know how much weight there is in this bill on that program?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not consider that there is any onerous burden whatsoever in this bill. We have put a reasonable amount in here, \$195 million, because, after all, if we cannot afford to spend in 1 year the price of an aircraft carrier to conserve our soil upon which our future generations will have to depend, I think things have come to a pretty pass in this Nation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. YOUNG. I have received several inquiries especially in reference to the \$800,000 for the nursery program. They are fearful it will jeopardize some of our western ranges.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. This bill carries a total of \$800,000 for those nurseries. Of course, this does mean a shading down of the present program to the extent where the Soil Conservation Service can operate approximately 8 or 9 of these nurseries.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is my understanding they can operate about three-fourths of the nurseries they have. From all the information at our command it looks like there are some nurseries throughout the United States that they could well let the State take over or in some instances maintain them. This will let the rest of those carry on.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In this particular instance, in reply to the gentleman, we have allowed almost twice what the Eisenhower budget asked for those nurseries.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 5, line 10, insert: "Provided further, That transfers not to exceed \$11,000 may be made to this appropriation from the several appropriations of the Agricultural Research Administration for general-use capital improvements at the Agricultural Research Center."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the

amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is the technical motion that I referred to previously.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which action was taken on the motion was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD prior to the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFeree

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] be relieved as a conferee on the bill H. R. 5134, and that the Speaker appoint another conferee to fill the vacancy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints to the committee of conference the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. JONAS. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the appointment by the Speaker.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4017) to provide for the conveyance of certain land and improvements to the England Special School District of the State of Arkansas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration therefor, to the England Special School District of the State of Arkansas, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land, and all improvements thereon, in the southwest quarter of section 35, township 1 north, range 10 west, in Lonoke County, Ark., more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the northeast corner of section 2, township 1 south, range 10 west, thence north eighty-nine degrees eight minutes west for a distance of two thousand and thirty feet to the west right-of-way line of project road; thence along said project road right-of-way line north one degree fifty-eight minutes east, for a distance of one thousand one hundred and seventy-two feet, more or less, to an iron pipe for the point of beginning; thence north eighty-eight degrees two minutes west for a distance of three hundred and forty feet to

an iron pipe, thence north one degree fifty-eight minutes east for a distance of seven hundred and eight feet to an iron pipe; thence north twenty-seven degrees thirty-two minutes east for a distance of three hundred and forty-seven feet to an iron pipe; thence south forty-four degrees thirteen minutes east for a distance of two hundred and sixty-three feet to an iron pipe; thence south one degree fifty-eight minutes west for a distance of eight hundred thirty-nine and five-tenths feet, more or less, to the point of beginning, containing seven and three one-hundredths acres more or less.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 1, line 9, strike out "more particularly described as follows" and insert "such conveyance to be made only upon the agreement of the England Special School District that all proceeds from the sale of the said property shall be used exclusively to acquire permanent school fixtures for the England Special School District, said property being more particularly described as follows."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 347 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5894) to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 and certain other provisions of law to provide adequate protection for American workers, miners, farmers, and producers, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means or amendments proposing to strike out a section, paragraph, or subparagraph of the bill. Amendments that may be offered to said bill under

that she may purchase it from behind the Iron Curtain. These are, of course, just speculations. It is not a speculation, however, it is a fact, a fact as simple as one and one makes two that the United States is going to be selling less wheat in the world market than she would have if Great Britain had been persuaded to sign the International Wheat Agreement. I think this whole thing has been bungled and bungled badly. This is not just my opinion and it is not just a Democratic opinion. Let I be charged with having made a partisan attack, let me quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 11, 1953, on page 8559 where there appears the following statement by Senator YOUNG, Republican, of North Dakota:

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I do not believe our wheat supply situation is too gloomy, particularly with reference to our surplus situation. It is true that we have had some sizable costs in the export of wheat. The International Wheat Agreement price of \$2.05 a bushel is too high, I believe.

I think we were very unwise in not setting the price at \$2 a bushel and thus bringing Great Britain into the agreement.

Both the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] and myself interrogated Mr. John H. Davis, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, at considerable length when he appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee, about various aspects of the negotiations at this year's meeting of the Wheat Council. His answers were singularly unrewarding. He seemed quite vague and uninformed. Finally, I asked this gentleman to furnish for the record specific facts about what actually occurred during the negotiations. A week passed and that information is still not forthcoming.

The central difficulty appears to have been the gross inexperience of Under Secretary Morse and his fellow United States delegates. I can only hope that they are more alert and diligent in protecting the interest of the American farmer here at home.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 2 of the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 945) is amended by inserting before the parenthesis at the end of the first sentence thereof the following: "and the agreement revising and renewing the International Wheat Agreement for a period ending July 31, 1956, signed by Australia, Canada, France, the United States, and certain wheat importing countries."

Sec. 2. Reference in any law to the International Wheat Agreement of 1949 shall be deemed to include the agreement revising and renewing the International Wheat Agreement.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 360 was laid on the table.

AMENDING SUBMERGED LANDS ACT

Mr. GRAHAM submitted the following conference report and statement on the

bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1031)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.'"

"Sec. 2. Definitions: When used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'outer Continental Shelf' means all submerged lands lying seaward and outside of the area of lands beneath navigable waters as defined in section 2 of the Submerged Lands Act (Public Law 31, Eighty-third Congress, first session), and of which the subsoil and seabed appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction and control;

"(b) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior;

"(c) The term 'mineral lease' means any form of authorization for the exploration for, or development or removal of deposits of, oil, gas, or other minerals; and

"(d) The term 'person' includes, in addition to a natural person, an association, a State, a political subdivision of a State, or a private, public, or municipal corporation.

"Sec. 3. Jurisdiction Over Outer Continental Shelf: (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction, control, and power of disposition as provided in this Act.

"(b) This Act shall be construed in such manner that the character as high seas of the waters above the outer Continental Shelf and the right to navigation and fishing therein shall not be affected.

"Sec. 4. Laws Applicable to Outer Continental Shelf: (a) (1) The Constitution and laws and civil and political jurisdiction of the United States are hereby extended to the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf and to all artificial islands and fixed structures which may be erected thereon for the purpose of exploring for, developing, removing, and transporting resources therefrom, to the same extent as if the outer Continental Shelf were an area of exclusive Federal jurisdiction located within a State: *Provided, however,* That mineral leases on the outer Continental Shelf shall be maintained or issued only under the provisions of this Act.

"(2) To the extent that they are applicable and not inconsistent with this Act or with other Federal laws and regulations of the Secretary now in effect or hereafter adopted, the civil and criminal laws of each adjacent State as of the effective date of this Act are hereby declared to be the law of the United States for that portion of the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf, and artificial islands and fixed structures erected thereon, which would be within the area of the State if its boundaries were extended seaward to the outer margin of the outer Continental Shelf, and the President shall determine and publish in the Federal Register such projected lines extending seaward and defining each such area. All of such applicable laws shall be administered and enforced by the appropriate officers and courts of the United States.

State taxation laws shall not apply to the outer Continental Shelf.

"(3) The provisions of this section for adoption of State law as the law of the United States shall never be interpreted as a basis for claiming any interest in or jurisdiction on behalf of any State for any purpose over the seabed and subsoil of the outer Continental Shelf, or the property and natural resources thereof or the revenues therefrom.

"(b) The United States district courts shall have original jurisdiction of cases and controversies arising out of or in connection with any operations conducted on the outer Continental Shelf for the purpose of exploring for, developing, removing or transporting by pipeline the natural resources, or involving rights to the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf, and proceedings with respect to any such case or controversy may be instituted in the judicial district in which any defendant resides or may be found, or in the judicial district of the adjacent State nearest the place where the cause of action arose.

"(c) With respect to disability or death of an employee resulting from any injury occurring as the result of operations described in subsection (b), compensation shall be payable under the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. For the purposes of the extension of the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act under this section—

"(1) the term 'employee' does not include a master or member of a crew of any vessel, or an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof or of any State or foreign government, or of any political subdivision thereof;

"(2) the term 'employer' means an employer any of whose employees are employed in such operations; and

"(3) the term 'United States' when used in a geographical sense includes the outer Continental Shelf and artificial islands and fixed structures thereon.

"(d) For the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, any unfair labor practice, as defined in such Act, occurring upon any artificial island or fixed structure referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to have occurred within the judicial district of the adjacent State nearest the place of location of such island or structure.

"(e) (1) The head of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall have authority to promulgate and enforce such reasonable regulations with respect to lights and other warning devices, safety equipment, and other matters relating to the promotion of safety of life and property on the islands and structures referred to in subsection (a) or on the waters adjacent thereto, as he may deem necessary.

"(2) The head of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may mark for the protection of navigation any such island or structure whenever the owner has failed suitably to mark the same in accordance with regulations issued hereunder, and the owner shall pay the cost thereof. Any person, firm, company, or corporation who shall fail or refuse to obey any of the lawful rules and regulations issued hereunder shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be fined not more than \$100 for each offense. Each day during which such violation shall continue shall be considered a new offense.

"(f) The authority of the Secretary of the Army to prevent obstruction to navigation in the navigable waters of the United States is hereby extended to artificial islands and fixed structures located on the outer Continental Shelf.

"(g) The specific application by this section of certain provisions of law to the sub-

soil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf and the artificial islands and fixed structures referred to in subsection (a) or to acts or offenses occurring or committed thereon shall not give rise to any inference that the application to such islands and structures, acts, or offenses of any other provision of law is not intended.

"Sec. 5. Administration of Leasing of the Outer Continental Shelf: (a) (1) The Secretary shall administer the provisions of this Act relating to the leasing of the outer Continental Shelf, and shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out such provisions. The Secretary may at any time prescribe and amend such rules and regulations as he determines to be necessary and proper in order to provide for the prevention of waste and conservation of the natural resources of the outer Continental Shelf, and the protection of correlative rights therein, and, notwithstanding any other provisions herein, such rules and regulations shall apply to all operations conducted under a lease issued or maintained under the provisions of this Act. In the enforcement of conservation laws, rules, and regulations the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the conservation agencies of the adjacent States. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing provisions of this section, the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary thereunder may provide for the assignment or relinquishment of leases, for the sale of royalty oil and gas accruing or reserved to the United States at not less than market value, and, in the interest of conservation, for unitization, pooling, drilling agreements, suspension of operations or production, reduction of rentals or royalties, compensatory royalty agreements, subsurface storage of oil or gas in any of said submerged lands, and drilling or other easements necessary for operations or production.

"(2) Any person who knowingly and willfully violates any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary for the prevention of waste, the conservation of the natural resources, or the protection of correlative rights shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and punishable by a fine of not more than \$2,000 or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, and each day of violation shall be deemed to be a separate offense. The issuance and continuance in effect of any lease, or of any extension, renewal, or replacement of any lease under the provisions of this Act shall be conditioned upon compliance with the regulations issued under this Act and in force and effect on the date of the issuance of the lease if the lease is issued under the provisions of section 8 hereof, or with the regulations issued under the provisions of section 6 (b), clause (2), hereof if the lease is maintained under the provisions of section 6 hereof.

"(b) (1) Whenever the owner of a non-producing lease fails to comply with any of the provisions of this Act, or of the lease, or of the regulations issued under this Act and in force and effect on the date of the issuance of the lease if the lease is issued under the provisions of section 8 hereof, or of the regulations issued under the provisions of section 6 (b), clause (2), hereof, if the lease is maintained under the provisions of section 6 hereof, such lease may be canceled by the Secretary, subject to the right of judicial review as provided in section 8 (j), if such default continues for the period of thirty days after mailing of notice by registered letter to the lease owner at his record post office address.

"(2) Whenever the owner of any producing lease fails to comply with any of the provisions of this Act, or of the lease, or of the regulations issued under this Act and in force and effect on the date of the issuance of the lease if the lease is issued under the provisions of section 8 hereof, or of the regulations issued under the provisions of section 6 (b), clause (2), hereof, if the lease is maintained under the provisions of section 6 hereof, such lease may be canceled by the Secretary, subject to the right of judicial review as provided in section 8 (j), if such default continues for the period of thirty days after mailing of notice by registered letter to the lease owner at his record post office address.

visions of section 8 hereof, or of the regulations issued under the provisions of section 6 (b), clause (2), hereof, if the lease is maintained under the provisions of section 6 hereof, such lease may be forfeited and canceled by an appropriate proceeding in any United States district court having jurisdiction under the provisions of section 4 (b) of this Act.

"(c) Rights-of-way through the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, whether or not such lands are included in a lease maintained or issued pursuant to this Act, may be granted by the Secretary for pipeline purposes for the transportation of oil, natural gas, sulphur, or other mineral under such regulations and upon such conditions as to the application therefor and the survey, location and width thereof as may be prescribed by the Secretary, and upon the express condition that such oil or gas pipelines shall transport or purchase without discrimination, oil or natural gas produced from said submerged lands in the vicinity of the pipeline in such proportionate amounts as the Federal Power Commission, in the case of gas, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, in the case of oil, may, after a full hearing with due notice thereof to the interested parties, determine to be reasonable, taking into account, among other things, conservation and the prevention of waste. Failure to comply with the provisions of this section or the regulations and conditions prescribed thereunder shall be ground for forfeiture of the grant in an appropriate judicial proceeding instituted by the United States in any United States district court having jurisdiction under the provisions of section 4 (b) of this Act.

"Sec. 6. Maintenance of Leases on Outer Continental Shelf: (a) The provisions of this section shall apply to any mineral lease covering submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf issued by any State (including any extension, renewal, or replacement thereof heretofore granted pursuant to such lease or under the laws of such State) if—

"(1) such lease, or a true copy thereof, is filed with the Secretary by the lessee or his duly authorized agent within 90 days from the effective date of this Act, or within such further period or periods as provided in section 7 hereof or as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary;

"(2) such lease was issued prior to December 21, 1948, and would have been on June 5, 1950, in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it had the State had authority to issue such lease;

"(3) there is filed with the Secretary within the period or periods specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection, (A) a certificate issued by the State official or agency having jurisdiction over such lease stating that it would have been in force and effect as required by the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection, or (B) in the absence of such certificate, evidence in the form of affidavits, receipts, canceled checks, or other documents that may be required by the Secretary, sufficient to prove that such lease would have been so in force and effect;

"(4) except as otherwise provided in section 7 hereof, all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such lease between June 5, 1950, and the effective date of this Act, which have not been paid in accordance with the provisions thereof, or to the Secretary or to the Secretary of the Navy, are paid to the Secretary within the period or periods specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such lease after the effective date of this Act, are paid to the Secretary, who shall deposit such payments in the Treasury in accordance with section 9 of this Act;

"(5) the holder of such lease certifies that such lease shall continue to be subject to the overriding royalty obligations existing on the effective date of this Act;

"(6) such lease was not obtained by fraud or misrepresentation;

"(7) such lease, if issued on or after June 23, 1947, was issued upon the basis of competitive bidding;

"(8) such lease provides for a royalty to the lessor on oil and gas of not less than 12½ per centum and on sulphur of not less than 5 per centum in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold from the lease, or, in any case in which the lease provides for a lesser royalty, the holder thereof consents in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the increase of the royalty to the minimum herein specified;

"(9) the holder thereof pays to the Secretary within the period or periods specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection an amount equivalent to any severance, gross production, or occupation taxes imposed by the State issuing the lease on the production from the lease, less the State's royalty interest in such production, between June 5, 1950, and the effective date of this Act and not heretofore paid to the State, and thereafter pays to the Secretary as an additional royalty on the production from the lease, less the United States' royalty interest in such production, a sum of money equal to the amount of the severance, gross production, or occupation taxes which would have been payable on such production to the State issuing the lease under its laws as they existed on the effective date of this Act;

"(10) such lease will terminate within a period of not more than five years from the effective date of this Act in the absence of production or operations for drilling, or, in any case in which the lease provides for a longer period, the holder thereof consents in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the reduction of such period so that it will not exceed the maximum period herein specified; and

"(11) the holder of such lease furnishes such surety bond, if any, as the Secretary may require and complies with such other reasonable requirements as the Secretary may deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

"(b) Any person holding a mineral lease, which as determined by the Secretary meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section, may continue to maintain such lease, and may conduct operations thereunder, in accordance with (1) its provisions as to the area, the minerals covered, rentals and, subject to the provisions of paragraphs (8), (9) and (10) of subsection (a) of this section, as to royalties and as to the term thereof and of any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing such lease, or, if oil or gas was not being produced in paying quantities from such lease on or before December 11, 1950, or if production in paying quantities has ceased since June 5, 1950, or if the primary term of such lease has expired since December 11, 1950, then for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of such lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of such State, and (2) such regulations as the Secretary may under section 5 of this Act prescribe within ninety days after making his determination that such lease meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section: *Provided, however,* That any rights to sulphur under any lease maintained under the provisions of this subsection shall not extend beyond the primary term of such lease or any extension thereof

under the provisions of such subsection (b) unless sulphur is being produced in paying quantities or drilling, well reworking, plant construction, or other operations for the production of sulphur, as approved by the Secretary, are being conducted on the area covered by such lease on the date of expiration of such primary term or extension: *Provided further*, That if sulphur is being produced in paying quantities on such date, then such rights shall continue to be maintained in accordance with such lease and the provisions of this Act: *Provided further*, That, if the primary term of a lease being maintained under subsection (b) hereof has expired prior to the effective date of this Act and oil or gas is being produced in paying quantities on such date, then such rights to sulphur as the lessee may have under such lease shall continue for twenty-four months from the effective date of this Act and as long thereafter as sulphur is produced in paying quantities, or drilling, well working, plant construction, or other operations for the production of sulphur, as approved by the Secretary, are being conducted on the area covered by the lease.

"(c) The permission granted in subsection (b) of this section shall not be construed to be a waiver of such claims, if any, as the United States may have against the lessor or the lessee or any other person respecting sums payable or paid for or under the lease, or respecting activities conducted under the lease, prior to the effective date of this Act.

"(d) Any person complaining of a negative determination by the Secretary of the Interior under this section may have such determination reviewed by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia by filing a petition for review within sixty days after receiving notice of such action by the Secretary.

"(e) In the event any lease maintained under this section covers lands beneath navigable waters, as that term is used in the Submerged Lands Act, as well as lands of the outer Continental Shelf, the provisions of this section shall apply to such lease only insofar as it covers lands of the outer Continental Shelf.

"Sec. 7. Controversy Over Jurisdiction: In the event of a controversy between the United States and a State as to whether or not lands are subject to the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of section 6 of this Act, and with the concurrence of the Attorney General of the United States, to negotiate and enter into agreements with the State, its political subdivision or grantee or a lessee thereof, respecting operations under existing mineral leases and payment and impounding of rents, royalties, and other sums payable thereunder, or with the State, its political subdivision or grantee, respecting the issuance or nonissuance of new mineral leases pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy. The authorization contained in the preceding sentence of this section shall not be construed to be a limitation upon the authority conferred on the Secretary in other sections of this Act. Payments made pursuant to such agreement, or pursuant to any stipulation between the United States and a State, shall be considered as compliance with section 6 (a) (4) hereof. Upon the termination of such agreement or stipulation by reason of the final settlement or adjudication of such controversy, if the lands subject to any mineral lease are determined to be in whole or in part lands subject to the provisions of this Act, the lessee, if he has not already done so, shall comply with the requirements of section 6 (a), and thereupon the provisions of section 6 (b) shall govern such lease. The notice concerning "Oil and Gas Operations in the Submerged Coastal Lands of the Gulf of Mexico" issued by the Secretary on December 11, 1950 (15 F. R. 8835), as amended by the notice dated Janu-

ary 26, 1951 (16 F. R. 953), and as supplemented by the notices dated February 2, 1951 (16 F. R. 1203), March 5, 1951 (16 F. R. 2195), April 23, 1951 (16 F. R. 3823), June 25, 1951 (16 F. R. 6404), August 22, 1951 (16 F. R. 8720), October 24, 1951 (16 F. R. 10998), December 21, 1951 (17 F. R. 43), March 25, 1952 (17 F. R. 2821), June 26, 1952 (17 F. R. 5833), and December 24, 1952 (18 F. R. 48), respectively, is hereby approved and confirmed.

"Sec. 8. Leasing of Outer Continental Shelf: (a) In order to meet the urgent need for further exploration and development of the oil and gas deposits of the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, the Secretary is authorized to grant to the highest responsible qualified bidder by competitive bidding under regulations promulgated in advance, oil and gas leases on submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf which are not covered by leases meeting the requirements of subsection (a) of section 6 of this Act. The bidding shall be (1) by sealed bids, and (2) at the discretion of the Secretary, on the basis of a cash bonus with a royalty fixed by the Secretary at not less than 12½ per centum in amount or value of the production saved, removed or sold, or on the basis of royalty, but at not less than the per centum above mentioned, with a cash bonus fixed by the Secretary.

"(b) An oil and gas lease issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall (1) cover a compact area not exceeding five thousand seven hundred and sixty acres, as the Secretary may determine, (2) be for a period of five years and as long thereafter as oil or gas may be produced from the area in paying quantities, or drilling or well reworking operations as approved by the Secretary are conducted thereon, (3) require the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ per centum, in the amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold from the lease, and (4) contain such rental provisions and such other terms and provisions as the Secretary may prescribe at the time of offering the area for lease.

"(c) In order to meet the urgent need for further exploration and development of the sulphur deposits in the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, the Secretary is authorized to grant to the qualified persons offering the highest cash bonuses on a basis of competitive bidding sulphur leases on submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, which are not covered by leases which include sulphur and meet the requirements of subsection (a) of section 6 of this Act, and which sulphur leases shall be offered for bid by sealed bids and granted on separate leases from oil and gas leases, and for a separate consideration, and without priority or preference accorded to oil and gas lessees on the same area.

"(d) A sulphur lease issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall (1) cover an area of such size and dimensions as the Secretary may determine, (2) be for a period of not more than ten years and so long thereafter as sulphur may be produced from the area in paying quantities or drilling, well reworking, plant construction, or other operations for the production of sulphur, as approved by the Secretary, are conducted thereon, (3) require the payment to the United States of such royalty as may be specified in the lease but not less than 5 per centum of the gross production or value of the sulphur at the wellhead, and (4) contain such rental provisions and such other terms and provisions as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe at the time of offering the area for lease.

"(e) The Secretary is authorized to grant to the qualified persons offering the highest cash bonuses on a basis of competitive bidding leases of any mineral other than oil, gas, and sulphur in any area of the outer Continental Shelf not then under lease for such mineral upon such royalty, rental, and other

terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe at the time of offering the area for lease.

"(f) Notice of sale of leases, and the terms of bidding, authorized by this section shall be published at least thirty days before the date of sale in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

"(g) All moneys paid to the Secretary for or under leases granted pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the Treasury in accordance with section 9 of this Act.

"(h) The issuance of any lease by the Secretary pursuant to this Act or the making of any interim arrangements by the Secretary pursuant to section 7 of this Act shall not prejudice the ultimate settlement or adjudication of the question as to whether or not the area involved is in the outer Continental Shelf.

"(i) The Secretary may cancel any lease obtained by fraud or misrepresentation.

"(j) Any person complaining of a cancellation of a lease by the Secretary may have the Secretary's action reviewed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia by filing a petition for review within sixty days after the Secretary takes such action.

"Sec. 9. Disposition of Revenues: All rentals, royalties, and other sums paid to the Secretary or the Secretary of the Navy under any lease on the outer Continental Shelf for the period from June 5, 1950, to date, and thereafter shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and credited to miscellaneous receipts.

"Sec. 10. Refunds: (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) hereof, when it appears to the satisfaction of the Secretary that any person has made a payment to the United States in connection with any lease under this Act in excess of the amount he was lawfully required to pay, such excess shall be repaid without interest to such person or his legal representative, if a request for repayment of such excess is filed with the Secretary within two years after the making of the payment, or within ninety days after the effective date of this Act. The Secretary shall certify the amounts of all such repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is authorized and directed to make such repayments out of any moneys in the special account established under section 9 of this Act and to issue his warrant in settlement thereof.

"(b) No refund of or credit for such excess payment shall be made until after the expiration of thirty days from the date upon which a report giving the name of the person to whom the refund or credit is to be made, the amount of such refund or credit, and a summary of the facts upon which the determination of the Secretary was made is submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmittal to the appropriate legislative committee of each body, respectively: *Provided*, That if the Congress shall not be in session on the date of such submission or shall adjourn prior to the expiration of thirty days from the date of such submission, then such payment or credit shall not be made until thirty days after the opening day of the next succeeding session of Congress.

"Sec. 11. Geological and Geophysical Explorations: Any agency of the United States and any person authorized by the Secretary may conduct geological and geophysical explorations in the outer Continental Shelf, which do not interfere with or endanger actual operations under any lease maintained or granted pursuant to this Act, and which are not unduly harmful to aquatic life in such area.

"Sec. 12. Reservations: (a) The President of the United States may, from time to time, withdraw from disposition any of the unleased lands of the outer Continental Shelf.

"(b) In time of war, or when the President shall so prescribe, the United States

shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the market price all or any portion of any mineral produced from the outer Continental Shelf.

"(c) All leases issued under this act, and leases, the maintenance and operation of which are authorized under this Act, shall contain or be construed to contain a provision whereby authority is vested in the Secretary, upon a recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, during a state of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President of the United States after the effective date of this Act, to suspend operations under any lease; and all such leases shall contain or be construed to contain provisions for the payment of just compensation to the lessee whose operations are thus suspended.

"(d) The United States reserves and retains the right to designate by and through the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President, as areas restricted from exploration and operation that part of the outer Continental Shelf needed for national defense; and so long as such designation remains in effect no exploration or operations may be conducted on any part of the surface of such area except with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense; and if operations or production under any lease theretofore issued on lands within any such restricted area shall be suspended, any payment of rentals, minimum royalty, and royalty prescribed by such lease likewise shall be suspended during such period of suspension of operation and production, and the term of such lease shall be extended by adding thereto any such suspension period, and the United States shall be liable to the lessee for such compensation as is required to be paid under the Constitution of the United States.

"(e) All uranium, thorium, and all other materials determined pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 5 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, to be peculiarly essential to the production of fissionable material, contained, in whatever concentration, in deposits in the subsoil or seabed of the outer Continental Shelf are hereby reserved for the use of the United States.

"(f) The United States reserves and retains the ownership of and the right to extract all helium, under such rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Secretary, contained in gas produced from any portion of the outer Continental Shelf which may be subject to any lease maintained or granted pursuant to this Act, but the helium shall be extracted from such gas so as to cause no substantial delay in the delivery of gas produced to the purchaser of such gas.

"Sec. 13. Naval Petroleum Reserve Executive Order Repealed: Executive Order Numbered 10426, dated January 16, 1953, entitled "Setting Aside Submerged Lands of the Continental Shelf as a Naval Petroleum Reserve", is hereby revoked.

"Sec. 14. Prior Claims Not Affected: Nothing herein contained shall affect such rights, if any, as may have been acquired under any law of the United States by any person in lands subject to this Act and such rights, if any, shall be governed by the law in effect at the time they may have been acquired: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation, or construction by the Congress that the law under which such rights may be claimed in fact applies to the lands subject to this Act or authorizes or compels the granting of such rights in such lands, and that the determination of the applicability or effect of such law shall be unaffected by anything herein contained.

"Sec. 15. Report by Secretary: As soon as practicable after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report detailing the

amounts of all moneys received and expended in connection with the administration of this Act during the preceding fiscal year.

"Sec. 16. Appropriations: There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 17. Separability: If any provision of this Act, or any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or individual word, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of any such provision, section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or individual word to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
RUTH THOMPSON,
PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
EDGAR A. JONAS,
EMANUEL CELLER (accepts
as to section 9, Hill
amendment),
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
J. FRANK WILSON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HUGH BUTLER,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
GUY CORDON,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON (ex-
cept as to deletion of
Hill amendment),

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

In the matter inserted in the conference report, the jurisdiction and control of the United States is extended to the seabed and subsoil of the entire outer Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of the United States instead of merely to the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed as in the original House version and also to the structures for their development such as artificial islands, drilling platforms, etc.

To the extent that the laws of adjacent States are not inconsistent with this act and other Federal laws and regulations, the laws of adjacent States are adopted as the laws of the United States for those particular areas. As provided in the original House bill, State taxation laws are specifically banned. These State laws are adopted as Federal law for the area of the shelf that would be in the boundaries of the State if such boundaries were extended seaward to the outer margin of the outer shelf. Provision is made for the jurisdiction in the United States district court for cases and controversies arising on the outer Continental Shelf and certain Federal laws are made applicable to the area such as the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act. Enforcement of the regulations with regard to lights, warning devices, etc., is placed upon the Coast Guard.

The Secretary of the Interior is charged with administering the provisions of the act relating to the leasing of the outer Continental Shelf and in this regard is authorized to cooperate with the conservation agencies of adjacent States. The control of the Secretary over the drilling and production practices is specifically spelled out. The Secretary is authorized to grant rights-of-way for pipelines and the Federal Power Commission in the case of gas and the Interstate Commerce Commission in the case of oil are authorized to determine the conditions of such

transportation. Section 6 of the new matter deals with the validation by the Federal Government of State-issued leases. Some 11 or more specific standards are set up which each such lease must meet before it is validated. These are all similar to the ones proposed in the original House version. In the case of sulfur leases, the royalty is fixed at not less than 5 percent.

Where there is a dispute between State and Federal Governments over whether a given area is within or without State boundaries, the Secretary is authorized, with the approval of the Attorney General, to enter into agreements to permit the continued development in the disputed area until ultimate determination is made.

The Secretary of Interior is authorized to issue Federal mineral leases on the unleased submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf. Conditions and standards for such leasing are specified for oil and gas and for sulfur. The conditions and standards set up in the inserted matter are similar to those in the original House version. In a sulfur lease, the Secretary, among other conditions, shall require the payment of such royalty as may be specified in the lease but not less than 5 percent of the gross production or value of the sulfur at the wellhead. Provision is made in the inserted matter that all rents, royalties, and other sums paid to the Secretaries of the Interior and of the Navy since June 5, 1950, to date and thereafter shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and credited to miscellaneous receipts. This is in substance exactly the same provision as was in the original House version. Specific provisions are made for refunds similar to those contained in the original House bill, as is the case with regard also to geological and geophysical explorations.

The President is authorized to withdraw from disposition under the act any of the unleased areas. These provisions are also similar to those in the House bill. A specific provision is contained in the inserted matter which reserves materials essential to the production of atomic energy.

The naval petroleum Executive order is repealed.

A "savings clause" has been inserted to protect any rights in an area that may have been acquired prior to the effective date of the act.

Provision is made for the Secretary of the Interior to submit to the Senate and the House of Representatives a detailed report of all moneys received and expended in connection with the administration of this act during each fiscal year. The usual language for appropriation authorization and for separability provision are also contained.

Title is also changed since the new insertion no longer amends the Submerged Lands Act, but is a separate act in itself.

LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
RUTH THOMPSON,
PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
EDGAR A. JONAS,
EMANUEL CELLER (accepts
as to section 9, Hill
amendment),
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
J. FRANK WILSON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

AID FOR EDUCATION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, no one act of this Congress can have graver consequences than the rejection of the original Senate proposal in the Hill amendment—to use the moneys derived from the leases on the outer Continental Shelf for grants in aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

How blunt is our vision and how limited our understanding when we fail to provide for the primary need of a democracy—an educated and informed citizenry. I need only point to the incalculable benefits to our citizens, and hence, to our country which flowed from the grant-in-aid universities which were established in the opening of our Northwest territory. Has the country at any time regretted this act, which was an act of faith in our future? We mean when we call this the land of opportunity not just opportunity for jobs nor opportunity for making money but opportunity to learn, to develop, to grow intellectually and spiritually, to meet the challenges of our responsibility as citizens of a democracy. It is shameful that our educational facilities in a country so great, so rich, so powerful, and so free, shall be so woefully inadequate.

We lack school buildings, we lack teachers. The birth rate is mounting, and with the mounting birth rate, these conditions will be aggravated. The lack is evident not only in elementary and secondary schools but in schools of higher education. There is the perennial cry especially during emergency times such as now, that there is a dearth of doctors, engineers, physicists, scientists. Recall, if you will, our real need for nuclear physicists, radar experts, and those skilled in jet propulsion.

A new era of atomic energy is upon us. The application of that new source of energy to private industry opens up great new fields of endeavor. In these new industrial vistas more trained minds are needed. There is even a greater cry at all times that the social development of man has not kept pace with the inventive genius of man.

There are intellectual and spiritual frontiers to be conquered which only a literate and informed people can do.

An educated free mind is worth a dozen battleships in the search for the fruits of peace. Here we are offered the most direct, the most efficacious way of achieving these ends. Do we dare reject it? I speak in the name of every mother and father who dream of education for their children and who know that dream must now fail.

Forty great national organizations endorse the Hill amendment. More than a million additional children entered the public schools last fall as compared with

the year before. It is estimated that for 6 years, there will be an influx of an additional 1 million children in our schools. Everywhere there is overcrowded conditions, basements, stores, churches have been used as makeshift. I am informed that one out of every three of our liberal arts colleges is operating at a loss. We are short some 40,000 engineers, to cite just one group. To boast, then, that we are a land committed to universal education is an empty boast. To adopt the Hill amendment would be in the deepest American tradition, significant of our pride, not only of our past achievements but our pride in the promise of the future. As some one has said, "Education is a companion, no despotism can enslave."

Let the country note what we do here today. Let those who understand the function of education in a democracy mark well how we kept or broke faith.

The remedy is at hand. Shall we look squarely at it or shall we turn away tucking our conscience away in the corner of a billfold.

The time of huge accumulated private fortunes is at an end. Fortunes like those of the Rockefeller, Vanderbilt, Mellon, and Ford families can no longer be acquired. High taxes preclude. Thus a great source of endowments to higher institutions of learning has dried up. Privately endowed colleges—especially smaller ones—are hard put to it to continue. They struggle for their very existence. Many have already died on the vine for lack of funds.

Consider this well. Remember that this proposal has not been before the House. Let us, at the very least, hold it up to the light and examine it. Let us be counted on this.

We thought well enough of education to bestow its great benefits on our veterans through the GI bill of rights. To the great bulk of our veterans it meant more than a bonus, more than a pension. It was a benefit that never could be squandered, lost or unwisely spent. It was the most enduring of all benefits we, as legislators, could devise. It prepared the GI for advancement in life, in the better discharge of his responsibility in his duties as a citizen and a greater enjoyment of his privileges as a citizen. What we seek here in adoption of the Hill amendment is the extension of that thought, the enduring benefits of education.

I signed the conference report but took exception to the deletion of the Hill amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 367, Rept. No. 1035), which was referred to the

House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, and all points of order against such bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SANTA MARGARITA RIVER, CALIF.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 368, Rept. No. 1036), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5731) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain certain facilities to provide water for irrigation and domestic use from the Santa Margarita River, Calif., and the joint utilization of a dam and reservoir and other water-work facilities by the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any provisions contained in said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LANDS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 369, Rept. No. 1037), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that

lieve that in the administration of this particular program involving foreign currencies there has been no abuse and certainly no expenditures made as to which Congress was not fully informed. In accepting the agreement I by no means accept the possible implication, which I know is not even intended—

Mr. FERGUSON. It was not intended.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want any implication raised that there has been any abuse of the use of foreign currency.

The limitations in the basic law authorizing the program are very clear, and they have been followed. It is distinct from programs involving counterpart funds under MSA and other programs. I do not think that at any time has this particular program been subjected to any criticism. Unfortunately all of them fall within the classification covered by the language of the so-called Rabaut amendment and section 1313 of this bill. I am relying upon the committee to defend the provision in conference. We have given up any effort to seek an outright exemption which was requested by the President and proposed in the revised budget which was intended by the amendment just withdrawn. Recognizing the point of wanting control in the other programs, we believe we have made a satisfactory compromise which I think will work satisfactorily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have one more amendment, which I send to the desk. It involves a transfer of funds under salaries and expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, after line 12, it is proposed to add the following:

**HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR**

Salaries and expenses: In addition to amounts appropriated under this head, the Administrator may transfer to this appropriation from any other funds available for administrative expenses not to exceed the sum of \$50,000 for studies and surveys which the President may request of the housing policies and programs of the Government and of organization for the administration of such programs, and for expenses of advisers and consultants in connection therewith.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are anxious to have a study made, as is the President, so that Congress may be advised on the important question of housing and public housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, has the Senator from Michigan given any thought to providing in the pending bill that any cargo shipped under the \$200 million advanced to Korea be carried in American flag vessels, rather than in MST vessels? I do not want to suggest to the Senator anything

that would interfere seriously with the program.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not believe it should go into the pending bill with regard to the \$200 million provision. Much of the food and clothing is already over there. I believe it is a matter which should come up later. I appreciate the Senator's interest in shipping goods in American bottoms, but we could not accept such a provision in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6200) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerks at the desk be authorized to change chapter and section numbers in order to correspond with the amendments adopted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. MCCARRAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

EMERGENCY RELIEF FOR FRIENDLY COUNTRIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2249) to enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available to the President, out of stocks of agricultural commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price support operations, such agricultural commodities as may be requested by the President for transfer (1) to any nation friendly to the United States in order to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of such nation and (2) to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government providing that such commodities will be so distributed as to relieve actual distress among such populations. Not more than \$100 million (including the Corporation's investment in the commodities) shall be expended for all transfers and deliveries under this act, of which not more than \$20 million shall go to any single country. The President may make such transfers through such agencies, in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate. At least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of agricultural commodities made available under this act and transported from the United States on ocean vessels shall be so transported on United States flag vessels

to the extent practicable and to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, including handling costs, plus the costs incurred in making deliveries hereunder.

Sec. 3. No programs of assistance shall be undertaken under the authority of this act after March 15, 1954.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements of peoples friendly to the United States."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. HOEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMPACT BETWEEN KENTUCKY AND VIRGINIA RELATING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A BI-STATE PARK

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall move that Calendar No. 696, Senate Joint Resolution 81, be made the unfinished business. Then I shall call up a conference report.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 696, Senate Joint Resolution No. 81.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 81) granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the establishment of a bi-State park by the States of Kentucky and Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report see pp. 10416-10419, House proceedings of July 29, 1953, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider the report.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have been consulting with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who is chairman of the subcommittee which handled this bill in the Senate, and also with the Senate conferees, including the chairman of the conference committee, in regard to commencing debate on the conference report on the Continental Shelf bill. I have also discussed the matter with the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. It was suggested that we might proceed for the next half hour with the debate on the conference report. Then at 2 o'clock we shall suspend the debate on the report, in order to have the memorial services for the late Senator Tobey, of New Hampshire. When those services are concluded, we shall resume consideration of the conference report. I hope the debate which occurs thereafter will not be too prolonged.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think it might save time if there were to be a quorum call at this time. Several Senators who should be present have had to leave the Chamber temporarily.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, I was planning to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Martin
Anderson	Gore	Maybank
Barrett	Green	McCarran
Beall	Grissold	McCarthy
Bennett	Hayden	McClellan
Bricker	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bridges	Hennings	Monroney
Bush	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Murray
Byrd	Holland	Neely
Capehart	Humphrey	Pastore
Carlson	Hunt	Payne
Case	Ives	Potter
Chavez	Jackson	Purtell
Clements	Jenner	Robertson
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smathers
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Kuchel	Stennis
Ellender	Langer	Symington
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Flanders	Lennon	Watkins
Frear	Long	Welker
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Mansfield	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent because of a death in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2383) granting the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of New Jersey and the State of New York known as the Waterfront Commission Compact, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40) favoring the placing of the inscription "United States of America" on containers of American-made goods for export.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 290) creating a committee to assist in the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the Congress of 1754, held at Albany, N. Y., on June 24 of that year, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 5141. An act to dissolve the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to establish the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5246. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5256. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the retirement of judges of the Tax Court of the United States;

H. R. 5471. An act making appropriations for the government of District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5805. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5877. An act to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5969. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION PLACED ON CALENDAR

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 290) creating a committee to assist in the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the Congress of 1754, held at Albany, N. Y., on June 24 of that year, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

THE ADMINISTRATION PROTECTS THE CIVIL-SERVICE WORKER

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, recently George M. Moore, a member of the United States Civil Service Commission, discussed the administration's posi-

tion with regard to civil-service workers, before the American Federation of Government Employees on Friday evening, July 24, 1953.

In this statement Commissioner Moore reviews the achievements of this administration in the civil-service field during the first 6 months following the inauguration of President Eisenhower.

As chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee I am proud of the steps we have been able to take during the past 6 months to strengthen our civil-service system. President Eisenhower has, on several occasions, stated very definitely his support of a strong civil-service system.

During the past 6 months there has been considerable concern among our classified civil-service employees as to the security of their positions. I think the record speaks for itself when we note that 86 percent of the total Federal employment was under the competitive-career system on January 20, and 86 percent is under the competitive-career service as of now.

It is true that a reduction in force and the process of bumping—which is most unfair in many instances—has resulted in hardship to many of our civil-service workers. This, of course, is unavoidable when Federal agencies are being ordered to reduce their personnel or existing agencies are eliminated. This program has been largely eased by actions taken by the Civil Service Commission.

Thirty-five thousand Federal employees who were affected by a reduction in forces since January have been placed by the Civil Service Commission, and as of this date, less than 1,000 career employees have not been reestablished in positions. This is a record one can be proud of and certainly demonstrates this administration's interest in the career worker.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER GEORGE M. MOORE BEFORE THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES JULY 24, 1953

I consider this occasion most appropriate to report to you the achievements of the administration in the civil-service field during the first 6 months following the inauguration of President Eisenhower.

In strengthening the Federal civil service, it is reassuring to know that the Civil Service Commission and the administration has the full cooperation and support of your fine American Federation of Government Employees.

First, the Commission recommended, Congress approved, and the President signed legislation repealing the leave rider which was enacted over 2½ years ago.

Second, the arbitrary dismissal authority which had hung over the heads of Federal employees for 3 years in the Department of Commerce, and for 6 years in the Department of State, was repealed by Congress.

Third, the Commission strongly recommended the repeal of the Whitten amendment which has been in effect for over 2½ years. Today I was advised by Chairman Ed H. REES that he intends to appoint a subcommittee to consider legislation repealing the Whitten amendment.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND IN BASALT, COLO.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there are two bills which I should like to have the Senate consider at this time. The first is House bill 3107. I ask the Chair to lay it before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 3107) to provide for the conveyance of certain national-forest land in Basalt, Colo., which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF LAND AT CHERRY POINT, N. C.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the second bill I desire to have considered at this time is House bill 2458.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 2458) to authorize the transfer of certain lands located at Cherry Point, N. C., and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF — CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the chairman of the Senate conferees on the so-called Outer Continental Shelf bill, House bill 5134, I am presenting to the Senate at this time the report of the conference committee, Report No. 1031. The House accepted this report last night.

Before I discuss the several minor amendments to which the conference agreed, I wish to advert for a moment to the major issue involved in the action of the conferees.

Members of the Senate will recall that after considerable debate and consideration of substitute proposals, the Senate, by a record vote, adopted what is generally known as the Hill educational amendment to the Outer Continental Shelf measure. The bill which I had the honor of reporting to the Senate, S. 1901, was amended by the adoption of Senator Hill's proposal, and the entire measure then passed by the Senate. The Senate then substituted its bill, with the Hill amendment, for the House bill, H. R. 5134, by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the Senate's provisions.

In the conference, the Senate conferees tried, with all the powers of persuasion at their command, to persuade the House conferees to accept the Senate amendment, and thereafter to secure some compromise in the field covered by the amendment.

HOUSE CONFEREES REFUSE TO COMPROMISE

The House conferees refused to recede from their objections to the amendment and refused to entertain any compromise in the nature of some provision which would sequester all receipts from the outer Continental Shelf for some period. The period suggested, first, was 5 years, and thereafter was 3 years. During this period the funds would have been held in suspense pending some affirmative action of the Congress.

The conferees on the Senate side stood firmly on the Senate bill in this respect as long as there was any hope of any agreement in the conference. The acting chairman of the Senate conferees then sought to find a parliamentary procedure by which the Senate might adopt the several perfecting amendments to the Senate form of H. R. 5134 with respect to which the conferees had agreed. In this way the question might have been narrowed to the single one of the Hill amendment.

An examination of the rules indicated that such a procedure was not possible. The reason was that there was but one amendment before the conference as a result of the fact that the Senate had passed its bill and then substituted the language of its bill for the House bill. The result was that the conference found itself with one amendment before it, and that was the entire bill.

REPORT ON WHOLE BILL ONLY

Under those circumstances, any report which could be presented to the Senate must be a report on the whole bill. Ordinarily, Senators will recall, when a bill is amended there may be numerous amendments, but they are single, separate actions, and a conference may take them up in order and, in its report, identify each amendment and the action taken thereon.

In this case, because of the fact that there was but one amendment before the conference, there could be but one amendment acted upon and reported to the respective Houses.

Under such circumstances, Mr. President, the majority of the conferees for the Senate became convinced that the only action that could be taken validly under the parliamentary rules under which we function, was that of acting upon a conference report on a whole measure on which there was agreement.

As a last resort the conference group representing the Senate made such an agreement. This meant that the conferees of the Senate were forced to agree to the demands of the House for the elimination from the outer Continental Shelf bill of two sections thereof known as the Hill educational amendment. This action thus brings the report before the Senate. It has already been before the House. It was presented yesterday and was immediately agreed to.

Before discussing the major question, which is the Hill amendment, I invite

attention to the several minor amendments which were made in the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Would the Senator inform the Senate whether the conference considered, in its deliberations on the Hill amendment, the Hendrickson amendment?

Mr. CORDON. The answer is in the affirmative, Mr. President. The Senate conferees first presented, as it was obviously their duty to do, the action of the Senate in adopting the Hill amendment, and urged that the House agree thereto. When there was complete and absolutely adamant refusal to accept the aid-to-education proposal, the Senate conferees called attention to the substitute for the Hill provision offered by the junior Senator from New Jersey. The Senate conferees vigorously urged that the House conferees agree upon it as a compromise.

HENDRICKSON PROPOSAL REJECTED

The House conferees refused to compromise and rejected the Hendrickson proposal. It was only thereafter that the Senate conferees tried to get the revenues requested, to prevent holding up further action by Congress in the affirmative field, and that also was refused.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CORDON. I call attention to areas in the bill wherein there was agreement between the conferees of both Houses and where I believe there will be little or no objection on the part of the Senate. I call attention to them because reference to either the report as it appears on page 10630 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, July 29, or to any other source, fails to identify the several minor changes in the bill as it passed the Senate. One could identify those amendments only by a careful comparison between the bill as it passed the Senate and the bill as it was reported from the conference.

The first of the changes appears on page 22 of H. R. 5134 as it passed the Senate.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Do I understand correctly that the conference report, down to the first change, which the Senator is about to outline, is the bill exactly as it was passed by the Senate?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Are we to understand further that the Senator will explain the changes that have been made in the Senate bill?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CORDON. The first amendment made in the bill as it passed the Senate is on page 22, where there was added on line 10, after the period, a sentence reading as follows:

State taxation laws shall not apply to the outer Continental Shelf.

In my opinion, that language is unnecessary. It adds nothing to and took

nothing from the bill as it passed the Senate. It was requested in a superabundance of caution, and was agreed to by the Senate conferees when offered by the House conferees.

CHANGE RECOMMENDED BY JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

The next amendment is on the same page, page 22, the language beginning in line 17, and ending in line 20 with the word "Appeals," was stricken from the bill upon the recommendation of the Department of Justice. The Department felt that the general rule of law, that the expression of one thing is the exclusion of others in the same class, might apply, and the conferees deleted the language indicated.

The third amendment appears on page 24, line 4. After the word "district," there are inserted the words "of the adjacent State." This is a perfecting amendment only.

The next amendment is wholly perfecting language, and is found on page 24, line 12, where the word "it," the third word from the end of the line, is stricken, and the word "he" is inserted in lieu thereof.

The next amendment is on page 25, line 4, and is in itself also perfecting language. The language "the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf and the" is to be inserted in line 4, after the word "to."

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. It is difficult to follow these changes unless a phrase or the entire sentence is read as it now appears in the conference report. Would the Senator from Oregon state exactly how the phrase now reads as recommended by the conference?

Mr. CORDON. Yes. The language now reads, beginning with the paragraph in line 3:

The specific application by this section of certain provisions of law to the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf and the artificial islands and fixed structures referred to in subsection (a) —

And so forth.

CHANGE IN PROVISIONS FOR USE OF STATE CONSERVATION AGENCIES

The sixth amendment is found on page 25, line 25. In order that that amendment may be better understood, I shall first read the sentence in which it occurs. Beginning in line 23, the sentence is:

In the enforcement of conservation laws, rules, and regulations the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the conservation agencies of the adjacent States, and if he deems it advisable, the Secretary is authorized to make use of such State agencies, facilities, and employees as may be made available to him.

The amendment strikes out all the language after the word "States" on page 25, line 25. The sentence now reads:

In the enforcement of conservation laws, rules, and regulations the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the conservation agencies of the adjacent States.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator explain the purpose of omitting the last words from that sentence? In other words, was it intended to change the meaning or effect of the Senate provision at all?

Mr. CORDON. The purpose of the change as presented to the conference by the House conferees was to make certain there would be no financial obligation on the Federal Government with reference to payment for services of officials of the State.

Mr. DANIEL. In other words, was it the idea of the conference that the Secretary is authorized, in his cooperation, to use the facilities of the States and State officials, if available to him, in enforcing the conservation laws and the conservation programs in the area?

Mr. CORDON. There was no agreement in that field. The agreement was that authority to cooperate with State agencies was adequate to meet the necessities, and the elimination of the language in question would make certain that there was no financial obligation on the part of the Federal Government in connection therewith. I cannot make a better explanation to the Senator from Texas than that.

I called attention to the fact that a colloquy was had on the floor with respect to this amendment, offered by the Senator from Texas, that the record of the colloquy in the Senate would be the best reference as to the meaning of the provision, and that the sponsor of the amendment made the statement on the floor that there was no financial obligation entailed on the Federal Government in such cooperation.

Mr. DANIEL. That is certainly correct. The States expect no payment for any services they render under this provision. It happens to be a case in which State cooperation will help the Federal Government, and the States are not asking for any compensation. The main thing on which I want to be clear is whether the Senator from Oregon understands that under the wording left by the conference the Secretary of the Interior could use any facilities or services which the States wished to make available to him in carrying out or enforcing the conservation laws.

Mr. CORDON. To the extent that such action on the part of the State would be a legal action, the Senator from Oregon is in full agreement. Cooperation certainly cannot be a one-way street. For example, at the present time, in connection with the Mineral Leasing Act and its application to federally owned lands in the several States, there is cooperation between the Federal Government and the States in which those lands lie.

The difference between that situation and the one presented by the outer Continental Shelf is that, with respect to the Mineral Leasing Act, the lands to which the act is applicable are within the boundaries of the State and there is a degree of State jurisdiction. With respect to the outer shelf lands, they are wholly outside the boundary of any State, and there is no jurisdiction on the part of any State. To that extent there cannot be an application of State law under

State jurisdiction. The distinction is an important one which the Senator from Oregon would like to have the RECORD show.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to ask one further question. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Oregon that if the Secretary deems it advisable in carrying on this cooperation with the State agencies and officials, he is authorized to make use of such State agencies, facilities, and employees as may be made available to him?

Mr. CORDON. Under existing law, yes, but with special regard to the fact that there is no State jurisdiction on the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. DANIEL. Yes; and the fact that the States are not to receive any compensation for it.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. The only thing I wish to make clear is that in spite of the fact that the conference has eliminated the last words of this sentence the Secretary will have authority to do exactly what the Senate said when the bill was acted upon in this body.

Mr. CORDON. That appears to be the case, as the Senator from Oregon sees it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the primary responsibility for laying down the conditions for granting leases is to be in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, and is not to be delegated or farmed out to the respective State authorities?

Mr. CORDON. The bill goes further than that, may I say to the Senator from Illinois. Not only the primary power, but the absolute and complete power, rests in the Secretary. He is acting for the Federal Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the State authorities will not have the power to determine whether applicant A rather than applicant B shall get a specific lease.

Mr. CORDON. Exactly.

The next amendment is found on page 28, and is a perfecting amendment. In line 11, the words "oil or gas" are to be inserted after the word "such." This is a perfecting amendment to clarify the language in the bill so as clearly to indicate that the pipelines referred to, which may be made common carriers, are pipelines carrying oil or gas, and would not be required to carry sulfur, if technical developments make it possible to transport sulfur in this way.

The next amendment —

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator read the sentence in line 11 to which he has just referred?

Mr. CORDON. It is a long sentence. It begins with the beginning of the paragraph in line 3, and reads as follows:

(c) Rights-of-way through the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, whether or not such lands are included in a lease maintained or issued pursuant to this act, may be granted by the Secretary for pipeline purposes for the transportation of oil, natural gas, sulfur, or other mineral under such regulations and upon such conditions as to the application therefor and the survey, location and width thereof as may be prescribed by the Secretary, and upon the express condition that such oil or gas pipe-

lines shall transport or purchase without discrimination, oil or natural gas produced from said submerged lands in the vicinity of the pipeline in such proportionate amounts as the Federal Power Commission, in the case of gas, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, in the case of oil, may, after a full hearing with due notice thereof to the interested parties, determine to be reasonable taking into account, among other things, conservation and the prevention of waste.

MINIMUM 5-PERCENT ROYALTY ON SULFUR

The next amendment reported for adoption or rejection by the Senate is on page 30 of the bill, in line 24. The amendment there inserts the figure "5" in place of the figure "10," in line 24. The net effect is to reduce the basic or minimum royalty on sulfur from 10 percent to 5 percent.

In connection with this change the conference had before it a letter from the Secretary of the Interior indicating that such investigation as his Department could make revealed that a basic royalty of 5 percent was probably more realistic than 10 percent. Secretary McKay added that in any event the Interior Department would attempt to secure the higher royalty in its call for bids for sulfur leases in the area.

The next amendment is on page 31, in line 12. It is wholly a perfecting amendment. The word "the" is inserted after the phrase "and thereafter pays to" and before the word "Secretary", so that the language will read: "and thereafter pays to the Secretary."

CHANGE IN DATE

On page 32 is found the next amendment. It is the substitution of the date "June 5, 1950," for the date "December 11, 1950," appearing in lines 20 and 21. The change was made at the urging of several conferees, in order that any operator in the area who had drilled and found oil might have the benefit of the provision for extension of primary term of lease, if there was production of oil on June 5, the date of the decision in the Louisiana and Texas cases, but oil was not being produced on December 11, the date of the decree and injunctions.

The representation made to us was that the lessees were in effect precluded from doing anything in the way of operations after the date of the decisions in the Texas and Louisiana cases on June 5, 1950. Under the former language a lessee might lose a lease because the production from a well that might have kept it alive happened to stop in November 1950. Since our purpose was to validate the leases that were being operated and held in good faith, the argument was made that the date might well be changed as suggested. Thus, the equities a lessee had under the situation just outlined would be protected.

The next amendment is on page 33, line 7, and is purely a perfecting amendment, the words "subsection (b)" being stricken, and the word "section" being made "subsection." The last change is at the end of the line.

The next amendment is on page 34, in line 22. The words "Disclaimer and" are stricken from the title of the section. The language as adopted by the Senate excluded any power for disclaimer, and

the amendment was made simply to make the title responsive to the section.

The next amendment is amendment No. 13, on page 35, line 2, and is purely a perfecting amendment, the letter "(c)" being stricken and the letter "(b)" being inserted. It is done merely to correct the reference.

SULFUR LEASING PROVISIONS

On the page 38 of the bill there is amendment No. 14. The language in the bill was changed in lines 11 and 12 beginning in lines 11 and 12. Beginning on line 11 the words "require the payment of a royalty of not less than 10 percent of the value of the sulfur" was deleted and the following language inserted: "require the payment to the United States of such royalty as may be specified in the lease but not less than 5 percent of the gross production or value of the sulfur."

The change brings the new leasing section in proper relationship to the section respecting existing State leases wherein the sulfur lease royalty minimum was reduced from 10 to 5 percent. The language was suggested by the Department of the Interior and adopted by the conference.

On page 39 appears amendment No. 16. It is line 7. The language "this section 8 of this act" is stricken, and after the word "act" the word "or" is inserted.

In line 9, after the word "act" the language down to and including the word "act" is stricken. That is amendment No. 17. The two amendments go together, so I have tied them together for the purpose of explanation. The language as it reads now, beginning with the paragraph in line 6, reads as follows:

(h) The issuance of any lease by the Secretary pursuant to this act, or the making of any interim arrangements by the Secretary pursuant to section 7 of this act shall not prejudice the ultimate settlement or adjudication of the question as to whether or not the area involved is in the outer Continental Shelf.

That again is a perfecting amendment.

THE HILL AMENDMENT

We come now to the controversial Hill amendment, which is section 9, beginning in line 21 on page 39 of H. R. 5134 as amended by the Senate.

In accordance with the agreement in conference, section 9 is stricken in its entirety, and new language substituted. The section reported by the conferees simply makes the necessary provision under the action taken for deposit of all receipts in the Treasury, and the language reads:

All rentals, royalties, and other sums paid to the Secretary or the Secretary of the Navy under any lease on the outer Continental Shelf for the period from June 5, 1950, to date, and thereafter shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and credited to miscellaneous receipts.

That would be the ordinary route for the money to take in this type of case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the oil for education amendment, otherwise known as the Hill amendment, was

passed by the Senate by a vote of 47 to 35?

Mr. CORDON. My memory tells me it was a vote of 45 to 37 but in any event the figures are reasonably correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that the House has never voted on the oil-for-education amendment?

Mr. CORDON. That is technically correct. The House has not voted on the amendment separately, as a single amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was the point the Senator from Illinois wished to make. So the conferees on the part of the House had no clear mandate to turn down the oil-for-education amendment.

Mr. CORDON. That is a matter of judgment on the part of the individual. The conferees felt they had.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The conferees wanted to turn it down, but did they have a mandate to turn it down?

Mr. CORDON. Their view was that they did.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is there any record showing that the House of Representatives turned down the oil-for-education amendment when it was presented separately to them? Was it ever presented separately to them?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon cannot answer that question with certainty. It was not presented as such in this particular measure. The Senator is correct that far. He may be correct all the way.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is my understanding that in the consideration of the Continental Shelf bill, the House did not separately consider the oil-for-education amendment. It is also my understanding that the House did consider two oil-for-education amendments in connection with the so-called tidelands bill this year, and that it so considered it in earlier years, although I have not checked back to see the actual record of the earlier years. I did check back on the record for this year, and there were two separate amendments by which the House rejected the oil-for-education amendment in the consideration of the tidelands bill, not the Continental Shelf bill.

Mr. CORDON. My researches show that that is the correct statement of the situation with reference to the House form of the bill. The House considered a bill dealing with the entire Continental Shelf, in which both lands within State boundaries and the outer areas beyond were included as a part of a complete bill. To that extent the oil-for-education amendment was a clear presentation of the problem, but there was involved—in order that we may have the complete picture before us—the other question, with respect to Federal control over the submerged lands within State boundaries.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Oregon is correct in his statement. The House tidelands bill was enlarged above as compared to what the Senate passed in the way of a tidelands bill, and did include, in addition to the tidelands, so-called, that is, the submerged lands

within State boundaries, all lands outside State boundaries which comprehend the outer Continental Shelf, which is covered by this bill.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The truth is there has been no vote in the House of Representatives on the oil-for-education amendment, except that the oil-for-education amendment was embodied in the provisions of two complete bills, which provided for Federal control of the submerged land resources from the low-water mark seaward to the so-called tidelands, as well as outer Continental Shelf. Those two bills were offered as substitutes for what we called the Holland joint resolution or so-called Holland bill, which dealt with the so-called tidelands. But the oil-for-education amendments were only provisions inserted in the overall bills, including both the tidelands and the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Alabama to say that the two amendments considered by the House of Representatives this year in considering their tidelands bill, including not only lands within but also lands without the State boundaries, were not applicable to oil for education?

Mr. HILL. No; they were a part of the substitute bills, and the substitute bills included both the so-called tidelands and the outer Continental Shelf. They were substitutes for the so-called tidelands bill the House of Representatives passed, which bill was analogous to what we knew in the Senate as the so-called Holland joint resolution, frequently referred to as the Holland bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is not my understanding. My understanding is that two amendments embracing the so-called oil-for-education philosophy were submitted and were passed upon by the House of Representatives.

Mr. HILL. Let me say that I have the record before me, and those amendments were not voted upon separately. As a matter of fact, last year the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], then a member of the House of Representatives, offered the oil-for-education amendment to the then so-called tidelands bill, the Walter bill. But the amendment went out on a point of order; it was held to be out of order.

There has been no vote in the House of Representatives on the so-called oil-for-education amendment, as an amendment, but only as a provision of a bill offered as a substitute for the so-called tidelands bill the House passed, namely, the bill relating to both the so-called tidelands and the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. There was in the House, in days gone by, a vote on the application of these revenues to the payment of

the principal of the national debt. Such an amendment was adopted a year or two ago in the House of Representatives. Was there any discussion in the conference committee of the possibility that if the House could not agree on Federal aid for education, the proceeds should be applied to the national debt rather than placed into miscellaneous receipts?

Mr. CORDON. There was such discussion, up to the time of the closing of the last meeting, 2 days ago. The managers on the part of the Senate urged that the managers on the part of the House agree to a simple sequestering of the funds, and provide that they be held in suspense for a period of, as first suggested, 5 years, and, as later suggested, 3 years, and not be available for appropriation until affirmative action was taken by Congress. That proposal also was made, but was rejected.

Mr. DANIEL. Was any vote taken in conference on the matter of applying the funds to the principal of the national debt?

Mr. CORDON. No formal vote was taken on it. An informal poll was taken on the matter, and it was rejected.

Mr. DANIEL. It has always been my thought that a good way to use these funds would be to apply them to the principal of the national debt. From what I hear today, that still seems to be a good idea.

Mr. CORDON. There is no doubt that we need to have some funds applied to the national debt; there can be no question about that.

DELETION OF HILL AMENDMENT

Mr. President, the change resulting from the action of a majority of the managers for the Senate would be to eliminate section 9, appearing on pages 39 and 40, and at the same time section 16, appearing on pages 44 and 45, beginning in line 24 on page 44. That section carries the language of the amendment to the Hill bill which was offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and was adopted by the Senate.

Mr. President, before I discuss the major question, let me finish calling attention to the amendments which otherwise appear in the conference report.

PROVISION FOR REFUNDS

Amendment No. 19 appears on page 40, in line 19: After the word "payment", to strike out the period and insert the word "or the effective date of this act." The amendment provides that requests for overpayments may be made within 2 years after payment; or if payment was made prior to the enactment of this act, and if that period was more than 2 years prior, the request may be made within 2 years after the effective date of the act, in any event.

The Senate provided that certain notice be given to Congress with respect to any refunds. The bill as passed by the Senate provided for such notice to be transmitted by the bodies to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of each body. It happens that this matter was considered by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives. So the language was changed, so as to read, "to the appropriate legislative committee of each body."

Amendment No. 20 appears on page 41, and is, again, a perfecting amendment.

NO AUTHORITY TO TERMINATE LEASES

On page 42 appears amendment No. 21, in line 10, and again in line 13. That amendment strikes out the language which would give the Secretary of the Interior, upon a recommendation of the Secretary of State, during a period of war or national emergency, the right to terminate leases. He would still have the right to suspend operation under leases, but not to terminate leases; and the words "or to terminate", in line 10, are stricken out; and in lines 13 and 14 the words "or whose lease is thus terminated" are also stricken out.

Amendment No. 22 appears on page 42, in line 17. It is a purely perfecting amendment. It would strike out the word "the" in the latter portion of that line.

Amendment No. 23 appears on page 44, and is a perfecting amendment. The word "in" is substituted for the word "on," in line 7—in that line, the word "on" is the second word; and in line 14, the word "in" is substituted for the word "of," which is the first word in that line.

IMPLEMENTATION OF HILL AMENDMENT DELETED

Amendment No. 24 is to section 16. I have described this amendment. It is a portion of the amendment to the Hill amendment. The whole section is stricken out.

There is a further change—purely a perfecting amendment—in line 22, and there is a change in the section number, and there is a like change in line 25.

Mr. President, that completes the list of the changes. It is clear that there is no major change in the sense of the act, except as to the use of the revenues which may arise under the act.

ACTION ON HILL PROPOSAL PRACTICAL

Mr. President, first, I address myself to that question. I shall be brief.

As I see it, and as the majority of the conferees saw it, this is wholly a practical question at this time. Your conferees—both the majority and the minority members—did everything they could to obtain agreement by the conferees on the part of the House with the action taken by the Senate. When they could not get that, they sought agreement on something in lieu of that action.

They were advised—and I am sure the minority members will concur in my statement—by the managers on the part of the House that they had their directions regarding this matter, namely, not to recede in any respect, at any time, on this point. We were given to understand that, rather than recede, the managers on the part of the House simply would not make a report to the House. We were in favor of having the whole matter in disagreement taken back to the House. The House managers advised that they would not so report. Under the circumstances, the Senate conferees were unanimous in feeling that the matter was of sufficient importance to justify presenting it to the Senate and requesting the Senate to take action.

JURISDICTION OVER OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mr. President, we have here a bill giving legislative weight to and implementing the claim now made by the United States of jurisdiction over the subsoil of a vast outer Continental Shelf along the shores of the United States. There are known to be valuable deposits of minerals, chiefly oil and gas, but also sulfur and perhaps other minerals, within the Gulf area, and there is reason to believe there may be such deposits along the Atlantic and Pacific seaboard. Those deposits cannot be explored or developed without statutory authority. There is no law that now appertains to the areas where these deposits exist, other than the law of the open sea. They are not areas over which there is absolute sovereignty on the part of the United States. They are peculiar in that respect, and the application of law must be by congressional action. Otherwise there will be no law, except maritime law, applicable to the waters above the Continental Shelf. It is imperative that the implementation be made; and it is vital to the United States that it be made at as early a date as possible. There has been a cessation of exploration and the investment of large amounts of capital for the production of oil and gas, as a result of injunctions which were issued in December 1950.

NO DEVELOPMENT BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

There is no way by which this job can be done except as it might be done by the Federal Government itself. There are no funds made available along that line, nor has any fund been requested; nor, I imagine, would any be granted. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama, as amended by the Senator from Arkansas, and agreed to by the Senate, is one which requires additional affirmative legislative action before it is implemented. The funds accruing from operations on the outer Continental Shelf can be made available for such dedication, or for any other purpose other than that of national defense, during the next 3 years.

Under those circumstances, and faced by an action on the part of the House indicative of a determination that the House would legislate on the outer Shelf only, and would require any legislation with respect to the disposition of funds to go to the legislative committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter for which disposition was intended, the conferees on the part of the Senate felt that it was better to bring the bill to the Senate floor. This action gives the Senate an opportunity to concur, to agree to the conference report, and to enact the bill without reference to this or any other particular or specific application of the funds. Thus, action can go forward, which must go forward if there are to be any funds, beyond those that are now available, produced for any purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it be fair to say that the House Managers staged a threatened sit-down strike in order to coerce the conferees on the part of the Senate?

Mr. CORDON. The condition was as the Senator from Oregon has presented it; and one may characterize it in various ways. We were faced with a condition, not a theory.

PRINCIPLE OF HILL AMENDMENT NOT ENDANGERED

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to accept the conference report. I believe it can accept it without any danger to whatever rights might be created were the Hill amendment to remain in the bill. Inasmuch as legislation must be passed before any funds can ever be allocated or paid to any State or agency, or for the benefit of any school child, we would be in no worse position if we were to pass the bill now, and then turn to the subject matter of disposition of the fund, since, under the terms of the Hill bill, there would have been 3 years within which to work out that disposition. We can do that if we accept the conference report, pass the bill, and provide legislation under which that action can be taken which it is necessary to take if revenues are to accrue from the outer shelf henceforth.

That can be done without prejudice to the disposition of the funds. That can be done and the question of disposition be resolved any time within 3 years without the loss of \$1 of revenue, if we are to assume that there is loss of revenue if the funds go into the Treasury as general revenues and are applied for general governmental purposes. If we are to look at this matter as one of protecting only education in this country, there is no loss to education if we take this road.

My position with reference to the Hill amendment was made plain on the Senate floor. Nevertheless, it has been my position, here as always, that if I serve on a conference, my obligation to the Senate is to protect as far as possible the integrity of the Senate and the action taken by the Senate. That was the view taken by all of the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT WOULD BRING IN REVENUES

When we were faced with an impasse, when we were face to face with the fact that there could be no report except a report of disagreement on this side, in which the House conferees refused to participate, it seemed to be just practical, sound, good sense to bring to the Senate that portion of the bill upon which agreement could be reached, and to give the Senate an opportunity to ratify the action of its conferees. By accepting the conference report we get an outer shelf bill on the statute books, under which revenue could commence to come in for whatever purpose the Congress might deem it should be used, including, of course, the purpose set out in the Hill amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not also a fact that, whether the Hill amendment remained in the bill or not, not one penny could go to the schools until Congress had passed a bill authorizing Federal aid to schools, involving the trouble-

some question of whether it should be limited to the public schools or should be given to both public and parochial schools, as well as other types of schools?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct. It is perfectly apparent that that is the situation. The Senator from Oregon is already being deluged with telegrams, many of them couched in exactly the same language, and all of them urging that the word "public" be inserted before the word "education."

The question is already abroad, and the discussion will become hotter as the days and months go by. We shall have to settle it finally. We face a necessity not only of determining the religious or public versus private school question, but also the question of allocation, the question of what yardstick is to be used, and for what purpose in the field of education the money is to be used. All of those questions we must face, under either approach.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon if it is not true that one of the House conferees was in favor of the oil-for-education amendment? I did not consider the other House conferees as being adamant against it. They seemed to assume that the Senate conferees would recede. They did not make any strong argument or give any sound justification for their position, but they acted as though they expected us to recede.

Mr. CORDON. Of course, every man looks at a picture through his own eyes. They stated emphatically, not once but many times, that on this matter they stood 6 to 1, and that they were going to stand 6 to 1, and would not report the amendment back to the House.

The Senator from Montana was not always present.

Mr. MURRAY. I was there all the time.

Mr. CORDON. Then the Senator was hiding from the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MURRAY. I was sitting right next to the Senator from Oregon. Maybe I was so close to him that he could not see me.

Mr. CORDON. Usually the Senator from Montana makes himself heard. I am happy to say that the Senator took part in the discussion and worked through it. I was under the impression that during a portion of the time the Senator was not present.

Mr. MURRAY. I know I was there all the time.

Mr. CORDON. Then the Senator from Oregon is mistaken and he regrets his mistake.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me that there was no such position taken by the other conferees on the part of the House. They were quiet about it. They assumed that the Senate conferees would recede. That is the way I understood it. I did not hear any very vociferous objections to the oil-for-education amendment.

Mr. CORDON. I can only say to the Senator from Montana that the Senator and I differ with respect to what was said and how it was said. I can understand the Senator's view, but I will have

to let each member of the conference speak for himself. I should like to have the Members of the House speak for themselves on this floor as they did in the conference. I know the situation which faced us was one that had to have either this answer, or, in this session, no answer.

MAJORITY OF CONFEREES APPROVED

I am presenting the matter to the Members of the Senate as the action of a majority of the conferees. The Senator from New Mexico was in complete agreement with all the actions taken except the action with respect to the Hill amendment as amended. The Senator from Montana did not sign the report. I am sure he is fully able to present his own reasons. I believe he was in accord with the actions taken except that taken on the Hill amendment.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to accept the conference report, to get this bill on the statute books, and the oil, gas, and sulfur, if we can find it, produced so that we may have something about which we may fruitfully legislate, namely, dollars in the Treasury.

THE DULUTH (MINN.) AIRPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I regret that I must digress from the subject matter which is before the Senate, because I believe in the rule of germaneness. I am very much interested in the conference report which is under consideration, but I want to discuss for a few minutes a situation which I think is so unreasonable that it is almost unbelievable. It is so unrealistic that it shows the most irresponsible judgment on the part of high officials in the Government. I can bring it to a point very readily.

The city of Duluth, Minn., has an airport constructed with Federal funds. It was constructed during the period of the war and after the war as part of our defense program. This airport has been used for the past few years as a commercial airport, and, more recently, at the direction of the Secretary of Defense, as an air-defense post.

The city of Duluth is one of the large port cities in the United States. It is a major port for the shipment of iron ore. I understand that in tonnage it is the second largest port in the United States. A large portion of the iron ore resources is located from 75 to 100 miles from the city of Duluth. Railroads bring the ore to the port where it can be shipped to the great furnaces in Chicago, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and other areas in the eastern section of the United States.

Mr. President, here is the problem. The appropriations for the Civil Aeronautics Administration, according to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, were reduced to a point where the CAA feels it must curtail a number of its control towers at airports.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield in order that I may join him in his comments, because I have a committee engagement which will require me to leave the floor of the Senate at about 5 o'clock.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I will say to my colleague that I share the same concern he is now

expressing about closing down the control tower at the Duluth Airport.

When the information that the control tower was to be closed down first came to my attention, I immediately contacted the CAA and was informed that there were not sufficient flights in and out of the airport to justify continuing the control tower. I tried to obtain further information concerning it, and was told there was a schedule of flights and if the airport did not have such a schedule of flights they could not furnish the service. They said the Duluth Airport fell below the particular schedule of flights the Commission had established.

I then went to the military authorities and found that they were of the opinion that the control tower was a function of CAA. I had gone back and forth about four times, and I finally said, "Wait a minute. You are going to tell me specifically who has the responsibility."

I finally was told by the CAA "We cannot continue operating the control tower unless there is a certain number of flights every day. If we make an exception in Duluth we will have to do it in other cases."

The Air Service said it was not their responsibility.

I say to my colleagues that we want to get this thing nailed down so that we will know who is going to control that tower. At least, we shall not give up until someone does control it.

It is located in a strategic area, as my colleague has ably stated, with reference to shipments of ore. We are going to find out how we can get this control tower continued, and the last step which has been taken was to communicate with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] will receive from the Secretary of Defense a letter which will specifically give assurance that the towers will be operated by the Air Service. If such a letter is not received then my colleague and I had better get together and do the things which will have to be done in order that the tower may be continued. But the last information I have is that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has been in communication with the Secretary of Defense. There is no question in my mind that the military have the funds. It is only a question of their assuming that the airport in Duluth is of sufficient strategic importance as to warrant continuance of operation of the control tower.

I desired to make this explanation to my colleague as to what the Committee on Appropriations has done in the last 12 hours on the matter. If we do not get proper results from this action, we shall have to take another step, and see what else we can do.

It is not a question of appropriating funds for CAA; it is a question of the military assuming the responsibility, and the military has funds with which to do it.

I share the same conviction as my colleague. I do not intend to stand idly by and see the control tower service discontinued, because it is too impor-

tant. It is entirely too important to our national security, and we should make certain that nothing happens in the vicinity of the iron ore docks at Duluth and Superior.

I wish to thank my colleague for discussing the matter at a time when we were both on the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the senior Senator from Minnesota for his keen interest in the matter, because in our respective calls to departments about our troubles, we frequently find that one or the other of us has already called.

I wish to help the Appropriations Committee today. I want to serve warning right now that there will not be a rafter left in the Senate Chamber unless the Department of Defense gets busy and takes care of the job of defending this country. The situation is so incredible, that it is, as I have said, unbelievable, absolutely preposterous.

Duluth, Minn., has an air defense unit, the 515th Air Defense Group has a squadron of F-51D fighter planes. It has about 3 jets. I understand it will soon be receiving more modern jets. It is a major air defense installation. It has two C-47's and one trainer plane.

The Federal Government has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars at Duluth for storage facilities, a dispensary, and land acquisition. There is an Air National Guard unit using the airport. The naval air station at Wold-Chamberlain Field, at Minneapolis, uses the airport as a base for activities in the bombing ranges it has in the cut-over areas of Minnesota, where they practice with live ammunition and bombs.

Mr. President, do you know how much is involved in the request to continue the operation of the airport control tower? Eleven thousand dollars. That is not even postage dollars for the Air Force.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration insists it does not have the necessary funds. The Air Force, which has the funds, will not transfer the money.

The mayor of Duluth was in Washington around the first of July, and he met with representatives of the Air Force. A transfer of \$11,000 to the CAA would keep the tower in operation. In that area are modern facilities, thousands of dollars of equipment paid for by the taxpayers.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I have received from the staff of the Appropriations Committee a letter which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I had discussed earlier in the day. The letter is in draft form, and a member of the staff has just brought it to me. Would it be of interest to the junior Senator from Minnesota to have it read, in order to show just what the Committee on Appropriations is endeavoring to do with respect to the matter? We have only until July 31 to obtain a decision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to my colleague that I should like to complete my thought, and then I will yield to him. But I recall that my colleague must at-

train. Wars are fought where it is cold. The last word I had about the Siberian climate was to the effect that it was even colder than the coldest areas in northern Minnesota.

When we talk about the defense of the country, when it comes to a suggestion which does not happen to involve an area alongside the Riviera, the Department of Defense says, "We had better save that \$11,000. We may need some new chairs for the club."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it not be possible to make this project attractive to the Air Force and Secretary if the swimming pool could be enclosed? Then it would be possible to have a hothouse atmosphere, with tropical plants, and the water could be electrically heated in the wintertime, so that the various officials would enjoy the swimming.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. That is an accurate description of some things which have developed.

I do not want to be unkind to the Air Force, but I want to tell them that they are going to have some trouble unless we get this money.

This project does not mean anything to me personally. Very likely I shall not fly up there within the next few days. I should be more likely to drive up in my Oldsmobile.

Candidly, it is nothing short of shameful that my distinguished colleague [Mr. THYE], who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, the junior Senator from Minnesota who is likewise somewhat active in the Senate, and the Representative from the eighth district, Congressman JOHN BLATNIK, who has been in the House for years, have been pleading with two agencies of Government for the small sum of \$11,000. Yet those bookkeepers and supersonic managers cannot find out how to get \$11,000 to us.

I warn the Department of Defense that if it does not get busy and if the officials do not make up their minds as to how to operate this installation, there will be no airport.

The airport happens to be in the control of the city of Duluth. The officials in the Department of Defense had better realize this. The mayor of the town is named Johnson. He is part Norwegian and part Swedish. When those Scandinavian people make up their minds, they make them up for good.

Let me read the resolution adopted by the City Council of Duluth:

By Mayor Johnson:

"Whereas a traffic control tower is a necessity at the Duluth Airport; and

"Whereas the discontinuance of Duluth control tower would result in great danger and hazard to human life and limb; and

"Whereas the city of Duluth cannot and will not be a party to a situation such as the discontinuance of the local control tower would cause to exist: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Duluth Airport cease operations and be closed at the same time that said control tower ceases its traffic control functions;

"Resolved further, That the city clerk be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to send copies of this resolution to Hon.

John A. Blatnik, Congressman; Hon. Edward J. Thye and Hubert H. Humphrey, Senators; and to Mr. F. B. Lee, Administrator, Department of Commerce, CAA, Washington, D. C.; and Mr. L. L. Schroeder, Commissioner of Aeronautics, St. Paul, Minn."

Mayor Johnson moved the adoption of the resolution, and it was declared adopted upon the following vote: Yeas: Commissioners Badin, Fiskett, Priley, Mayor Johnson—4. Nays: None.

Approved July 29, 1953.

I, C. D. Jeronimus, city clerk of the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of resolution passed by the city council of the city of Duluth, on the 29th day of July 1953, with the original document and record thereof on file and of record in my office, and in my custody as city clerk of said city, and that the same is a true and correct copy thereof, and the whole thereof, and a true and correct transcript therefrom.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the corporate seal of said city of Duluth this 29th day of July 1953.

C. D. JERONIMUS,
City Clerk, City of Duluth, Minn.

EXCERPT FROM COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF JULY 29, 1953—FROM THE MINUTES OF THE AIRPORT BOARD MEETING HELD 11 A. M., JULY 29, 1953

Mr. Hagberg moved, seconded by Mr. Butler, that the airport board recommend to the city council that the airport be closed unless the control tower is in continuous operation because of the danger to human life in using the airport with the amount of flying that is being done with both civilian and Air Force traffic.

The above motion was unanimously adopted.

I, C. D. Jeronimus, city clerk of the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of excerpt from council proceedings of the city of Duluth, on the 29th day of July 1953, with the original document and record thereof on file and of record in my office, and in my custody as city clerk of said city, and that the same is a true and correct copy thereof, and the whole thereof, and a true and correct transcript therefrom.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the corporate seal of said city of Duluth, this 29th day of July 1953.

C. D. JERONIMUS,
City Clerk, City of Duluth, Minn.

Mr. President, what is going to happen? Let me tell the Senate how the Government operates. The city government of Duluth will close down the airport. The Federal Government may think it operates it, but it does not. The city government is going to close down the airport. Then, Mr. President, do you know what is going to happen? The Department of Defense is going to say, "We must have that airport," and it will cost the Federal Government \$500,000 a year to operate it, when it can be kept going now for \$11,000.

I have stated my case. I wish to conclude by saying that I appeal to my colleagues to consider this critical situation. It happens in other places.

By August 1, 1953, unless the Secretary of Defense can make up his mind what to do about such a fantastic sum as \$11,000, which he can transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, a major airport, in which the Government of the United States has millions of dollars invested, and a major air defense installation, the 515th Air Defense Group,

will be without a control tower; and without a control tower planes cannot be flown safely in the climate of Minnesota, particularly in the wintertime, when we have blizzards, sleet, and snow.

If this is what is called efficient management of the armed services, God help America. I appeal to the Secretary of Defense while I am influenced by the spirit of compassion and kindness, to make up his mind to do something about this situation. If necessary, I will make this speech all over again, twice as loud and twice as long, so that it can penetrate the Pentagon Building directly, without benefit of telephone.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I regret that the majority of the Senate conferees did not see fit to bring back in disagreement the bill for the development of the outer Continental Shelf, which would have made it possible, without voting down the conference report, to get a direct vote again by the Senate on the oil-for-education amendment. As the situation now stands, however, the conferees having not seen fit to follow the course of reporting a disagreement, but having signed the conference report and agreed to it, the only course open to the Senate is to vote down and reject the conference report.

That is what I very much hope the Senate will do. If the Senate will do it, we will have an opportunity to instruct the Senate conferees further with reference to the oil-for-education amendment.

The chairman of the Senate conferees, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has told the Senate very candidly and very frankly that six of the House conferees simply sat there in the conference and said to the Senate conferees, "We will do nothing about this unless you agree to abandon, to desert, the oil-for-education amendment."

The oil-for-education amendment was agreed to by the Senate by a vote of 45 to 37. I may say that along with the oil-for-education amendment, and complementary to it, was the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. The House conferees sat there—six of them—six out of a membership of 435—and said, "Either throw out the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, together with the oil-for-education amendment, or we do nothing. We will just sit here. We will not even take the bill back to the House of Representatives and report a disagreement."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The amendment referred to by the distinguished Senator

from Alabama as the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas is the amendment which was actually offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, but I had offered it previously. Certainly the amendment did no violence in any way to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Alabama. It was my purpose, in supporting the amendment and in cosponsoring it, to implement and strengthen the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, which I was happy to support.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Arkansas supported the oil-for-education amendment and, as he has said, it was very definitely his intention and his desire to strengthen the amendment and to strengthen the cause of the amendment when he supported the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota to which the Senate agreed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I ask what the situation is? Unfortunately I had to be out of the Chamber on committee work and on other matters. Are we in the situation that we must either vote to accept the report of the conference or to reject it and send it back for further conference?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Arkansas has accurately stated the situation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is not necessary to move to send it back?

Mr. HILL. No. The question will come on the agreement to the conference report. On that question I hope the Senate will vote "nay," and thereby reject the conference report. If the Senate will do that, we can insist on the Senate amendment, and ask for a further conference; and the Senate can even go further, by giving instructions to its conferees with reference to the oil-for-education amendment, or any other provision in the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope the Senate will not hastily accept the conference report under these circumstances, because I feel the conferees on the part of the House have not given the matter the serious consideration and understanding it deserves. I had hoped that the Senator's amendment would be retained so that we might make that much further progress toward a solution of the entire problem. There is still lacking a working out of a proper and clear formula for the allocation of the funds.

Mr. HILL. But there would be a definite dedication of the funds to education, insuring and guaranteeing that the funds would be so applied.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The effect of the amendment would be to dedicate the funds, but there would be left the working out of a satisfactory formula.

Mr. HILL. Yes. I thank the Senator for what he has had to say, and I emphasize to him, as I sought to emphasize earlier, that there has never been in the other House a vote on the oil-for-education amendment, except as it was a provision, along with a number of other provisions, in a bill offered as a substitute. When the distinguished Senator

from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], then a Member of the House, last year offered the amendment to the so-called tidelands bill, it was ruled out on a point of order. This year Representative FEIGHAN, of Ohio offered a substitute for the so-called tidelands oil bill, which embodied not only a provision for oil-for-education, but also carried many provisions, taking in not only the so-called tidelands but also the lands on the outer Continental Shelf.

Representative PERKINS offered a similar substitute proposal, and that proposal carried with it not only the oil-for-education amendment, but also many other provisions dealing with so-called tidelands and dealing with the lands on the outer Continental Shelf.

So it is absolutely correct and accurate to state that the House has never had an opportunity to vote on an oil-for-education proposal, except as tied in with and as one provision in other bills dealing with the resources of the submerged lands.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite understand the situation with respect to the conferees not reaching an agreement on the amendment.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] spoke about that situation at a time when the distinguished Senator from Arkansas was not able to be on the floor. If I do not quote the Senator from Oregon correctly, I would be delighted to have him make the statement in his own way; but, as I understood the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the House conferees—6 members out of a total membership of 435—sat there in the conference and took the position that they would not report a disagreement and take the bill back to the House, and would not do anything unless the Senate conferees agreed to throw out the oil-for-education amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon. He sat in the conference. The Senator from Alabama was not a member of the conference. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I am not attempting to justify the position of the House Members.

Mr. HILL. I appreciate that fact.

Mr. CORDON. I am merely reciting the position taken by them. The House Members took the position, first, that the matter was not before their committee, and, second, they had a record of a point of order having been raised previously to that type of legislation, and the order being sustained—that was the Mansfield case—and they were instructed to stand by the provision of the House with respect to the disposition of the funds.

Mr. HILL. Did they state who instructed them?

Mr. CORDON. They did not state, but from other sources, including some Members on the Senator's side of the aisle, the position they held was the position of the leaders of both parties in the House.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. That might be true; but we find ourselves in the situation that the Senate is now asked to sign articles of capitulation and surrender to six Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish it to be perfectly clear that this amendment was never voted on by the House of Representatives.

Mr. HILL. That is correct; the amendment never was voted on by the House.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The point of order made last year could not have any application to this bill, could it?

Mr. HILL. Not at all. As I tried to make clear, the amendment was offered in the House of Representatives by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], then a Member of the House. It was offered to the so-called tidelands bill, not to this bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have never heard of a case in which the conferees of either House simply refused to make a report. Do the conferees have a right to refuse to report to their House? If they wish to be arbitrary, can they simply refuse to report to their House, when there is disagreement among the conferees?

Mr. HILL. I suppose they can, if they can "get by with it"—as the conferees on the part of the House did in this case.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But, according to the practice, can one group of conferees simply refuse to report to their House, if there is no agreement between the conferees? Is that the practice?

Mr. HILL. The conferees have great power. I would not say that under the rules of the House or the Senate, it might not be possible to discharge the conferees. But I do not think that has occurred.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has the Senator from Alabama ever heard of a similar case?

Mr. HILL. No; I do not think I have ever known of a time, during all my service in the Senate, when the Senate has discharged its conferees. However, that is the situation with which we are confronted; the conferees on the part of the House say, "Nothing doing. Sign up. Surrender, abandon, desert."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Do I correctly understand that an amendment similar to the Hill amendment has never been adopted on the floor of the House of Representatives?

Mr. HILL. I would not say that. The Mansfield amendment was an amendment—

Mr. LEHMAN. I mean this year.

Mr. HILL. Not as an amendment in and of itself.

There was a provision in the Feighan substitute bill and also a provision in the Perkins substitute bill, but that

was only one provision among many others in those bills.

Mr. LEHMAN. But the amendment itself, as such has never been voted on by the House. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. There never has been a vote in the House of Representatives on the amendment, in and of itself.

Mr. LEHMAN. So that action on the part of the conferees representing the House was clearly arbitrary, was it?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, under the rules, we are not supposed to indulge in criticism of the other body.

Mr. LEHMAN. I withdraw the word "arbitrary."

Mr. HILL. But the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has stated the situation. As he has stated, the conferees on the part of the House said, "We will have nothing to do with that amendment, and there will not be a conference report unless the Senate conferees surrender."

Mr. President, I do not like the word "surrender."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. In the conference, the conferees on the part of the House did not present a case against the oil-for-education amendment. There was no discussion at all. The House conferees merely expected the Senate to recede.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana was a member of the conference. As he has testified this afternoon, he attended every meeting of the conference. I wish to thank him for his service there.

Mr. President, I served for a number of years in the House of Representatives, and I am very proud of that membership. I would certainly reject any idea that the House of Representatives did not have the courage to vote on this amendment. In fact, a number of Members of the House of Representatives have said to me, "We are in favor of the amendment, and we would like to have an opportunity to vote on it."

Certainly, Mr. President, every one of the Members of the Senate met the issue. Not all Senators voted for the amendment; for reasons that were good and sufficient to them, some Senators did not see fit to vote for the amendment. But the Senate voted on the amendment. The Members of the Senate faced the question and met the issue presented by the amendment.

Why should not the House of Representatives speak on this issue? Why should not the House of Representatives vote on it?

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not know how the House would vote. But, regardless of whether the House voted the amendment up or voted the amendment down, at least in that case we would know how the House felt about the amendment, rather than be in our present situation, when we know only how six Members of the House happened to feel about it.

So, Mr. President, why should not the Senate insist that the conference report be returned for further conference?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It should.

Mr. HILL. Yes, certainly it should, as the Senator from Arkansas has said,

In that way we should let the Members of the House of Representatives, as the chosen representatives of the people, face this matter squarely and cast their votes on the amendment.

That is the only fair and reasonable thing to do, consistent with the dignity, stature, and position of the Senate of the United States. Surely we still believe in the Constitution, and surely we still believe that the House and the Senate are equal bodies, and should continue as such. But how long can that equality last if the Senate is to surrender to 6 Members of the House of Representatives—6 out of a total membership of 435.

Mr. President, the Members of the Senate have faced this issue. This measure presents the immediate and the challenging and the golden opportunity to dedicate these revenues to education, to let the American people know now that we mean to do something about the crisis in American education, and that we have acted to do something about that crisis—not that we have postponed and put off and thereby perhaps weakened and even endangered the future possibility of this dedication.

What shall we tell a teacher in a remote area, who is teaching in a one-room schoolhouse? Shall we say we would not stand up and fight, so that the teachers of the United States may have more adequate compensation? Are we going to say that? Many of the teachers today are living on a mere pittance. The teachers are inadequately paid. Today the teachers of America constitute the lowest paid group in the United States. Yet are we going to say to them, "Well, we just surrendered; we just gave up. We deserted your cause."

What are we going to say to the parents of all the boys and girls, the fine young children who attend classes in the schoolhouses of this land? Those boys and girls cannot speak for themselves. To use the words of Daniel Webster:

Though they cannot speak for themselves, there are those who love them.

What are we to say to the fathers and mothers of these children? They know the conditions under which their children go to school. They know the dilapidated condition of the American school system, the crowded condition of the classrooms, and the inadequacy of the school buildings. They know that the education of their children is being virtually cut in half because of the dilapidated condition of the classrooms and school buildings. They know that more than a million American children are forced to go to school half-time, because of double shifts in schools, and they know that some schools even have three shifts a day. They know that the education of millions of American children is suffering because of the fact that the teachers are paid so little. The teachers have been given such small reward for the work they do, that literally thousands of them have been forced to leave the teaching profession, and to take jobs in industry—in defense plants and in other avenues of business. The result of that shift is that in many cases the replacement teachers are inadequately trained and inadequately prepared.

Mr. President, just as water cannot rise higher than its source, so a class of schoolchildren cannot be better than its teacher. Let us remember that if we do not fill each golden minute "with 60 seconds' worth of distance run," we can never reclaim those seconds. If a child's education is impaired today, if the child is taught by a poorly trained, inadequate teacher, that child never can go back and reclaim the lost time. It is gone, and gone forever.

So, Mr. President, what are we to say to the parents of these boys and girls, these fine young lads and lasses of America, who are to be the citizens of tomorrow? If we do not stand up for them, if we say, "We took our stand, but because 6 Members of 435 Members of the House of Representatives said, 'You have to surrender,' we proceeded to surrender," what will the parents of the schoolchildren of America say?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am very glad the Senator is making such a strong fight to get the Senate to reject the conference report. I need not say to the Senator, who served, as have several of us, in the House of Representatives for a number of years, that the majority of Senators are in favor, through the use of this fund, of doing something for the schools of the Nation. Does the Senator not feel that the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives would also be eager to assist the educational institutions of the country, if they but had an opportunity to vote on the amendment?

Mr. HILL. I may say to my friend, as I said a little earlier, a number of Members of the House of Representatives have voluntarily said to me, "We are for your amendment; we would like to vote for the amendment; we want an opportunity to vote on the amendment." I think the Senator from Tennessee is absolutely correct. The Senator served in the House, just as I had the great honor of serving in the House, and he knows, I am sure, that the Members of the House, as well as the Members of the Senate, are willing to meet their responsibility, are willing to discharge their duties, to face the issues, and that they would be glad to vote on the amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator feel that, in order that they may have an opportunity to express themselves, we ought to stand unitedly for the rejection of the conference report, in order to enable Members of the House to have an opportunity to vote on the amendment?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly what I am urging the Senate to do.

Mr. President, what are we to say to the teachers and parents back home? What are we to say to the great educational organizations, such as the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, the American Federation of Teachers—which has been fighting for this amendment for so long—the American Vocational Education Association, the American Library Association, the National Grange, the National Farmers Union, the Cooperative League of the U. S. A., the American

Federation of Labor, the CIO, many other great organizations? Mr. President, if there is no objection, I wish to place this list in the RECORD, a list of those who have been fighting for this amendment for over 2 years. They have poured out their hearts, their efforts, and their labor in support of this amendment, seeking to do something for our schools and for our schoolchildren.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE ORGANIZATIONS HAVE ENDORSED THE HILL OIL-FOR-EDUCATION AMENDMENT

National Education Association; the American Council on Education; the American Federation of Teachers; the American Library Association; the American Vocational Association, Inc.; the National Grange; National Farmers Union; the Co-op League of the United States of America; the American Federation of Labor; the Congress of Industrial Organizations; the Railway Labor Executives Association; the Oil Workers International Union; the Communications Workers of America; the Textile Workers Union of America; the United Mine Workers; the United Automobile Workers; the Friends Committee on National Legislation; Americans for Democratic Action; Students for Democratic Action; the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees; Switchmen's Union of North America; the Order of Railroad Telegraphers; Brotherhood of Railway Clerks; American Train Dispatchers' Association; International Association of Machinists; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers; International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America; Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; Railroad Yardmasters of America; Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; Hotel and Restaurant Employees' and Bartenders' International Union; National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America; National Marine Engineers' Association; International Longshoremen's Association; the Order of Railway Conductors; the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers; the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; the Mayors' Committee for Offshore Oil; and the NEA Department of Classroom Teachers.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HOEY. I wonder what the Senator thinks about the matter of public education. I have received probably a hundred telegrams from my State, and perhaps 200 letters, complaining because the word "public" is not used before the word "education." What does the Senator from Alabama have to say about that?

Mr. HILL. All in the world that is proposed under this amendment is that Congress make the funds available for purposes of primary, secondary, and higher education. It was made very clear at the time the amendment was agreed to that Congress would have to enact future legislation providing for distribution of the funds before any of the funds could be used. The only issue involved in the amendment is the issue of whether the funds shall be used for education or whether the funds will go for some other purpose.

Mr. HOEY. Does the Senator feel that there is no possibility, under the present conference report of changing that provision in any way?

Mr. HILL. I do. I may say to the Senator that, once the conference report is voted down, and the bill sent back to conference, it will then be in the hands of the conferees. The provision would be in conference and under the rules of the Senate and the House subject to change or amendment by the conferees.

Mr. HOEY. Does the Senator mean that the conferees could submit another report, with the word "public" included in the provision?

Mr. HILL. The committee on conference would have the power to do that or make other changes.

Mr. President, I realize that we should vote, and I do not want to take further time of the Senate. I sought when the amendment was before the Senate, to emphasize the necessity of providing better training and better education for our young people, in order to meet the compelling needs of national security. I cited reports by many distinguished commissions and councils, reports which have been issued within the past 2 or 3 months, and which declare emphatically that our national defense is today suffering, and is today threatened as a result of our failure to build our human resources; that is, to properly train, prepare, and educate our children.

I gave as an illustration the testimony of Dr. Waterman, head of the National Science Foundation, who, a few weeks ago, in testifying before the House Appropriations Committee, called attention to the fact that by 1955 Russia will be graduating 50,000 engineers a year, while we will be graduating only 17,000. I read the report of the Engineers Joint Council, in which it is stated that we are, even today, being delayed in getting defense production and in carrying out defense contracts, by reason of the shortages of engineers, scientists, physicists, and chemists. The council did not stop there. It emphasized the shortage of doctors, nurses, and skilled specialists of all kinds. I may say that two of the commissions that made the reports were appointed by President Eisenhower when he was president of Columbia University.

Mr. President, unless we reject the conference report, we reject that which has been called the opportunity for an act of statesmanship equivalent to what was done in 1785, 1787, 1862, and in other great landmarks in the leadership of the Federal Government in developing education in this country. We recall the words of Daniel Webster, spoken of the ordinance of 1787 which set aside every 16th section of the public lands west of the Appalachian Mountains for the establishment and maintenance of schools. Webster declared:

I doubt whether one single law of any lawgiver, ancient or modern, has produced effects of more distinct, marked, and lasting character than the ordinance of 1786 * * * it set forth and declared it to be a high and binding duty of the Government to support schools and advance the means of education.

Throughout the entire life of our country, Congress has been faithful to this duty as declared by our Founding

Fathers and has passed some 160 acts providing for public-land revenues or general revenues for education. But if we adopt this conference report today we have witnessed an abrogation of this duty.

Mr. President, our Nation has grown great, rich and powerful, achieved the highest level of civilization, productive genius and standard of living in the history of man, not just because we were a broad expanse of fertile earth with verdant forests, deep rivers, and rich natural resources, but because our forefathers had the vision and the wisdom to use our natural wealth given by a bountiful Creator to provide an educational system that gave to our people the highest general level of intelligence and gave to our people the finest agricultural, industrial, professional, and scientific education and training on this earth.

Every one of the 159 million Americans owes a great debt to this heritage of education which our forefathers provided through the great land grants.

All we seek by this amendment is to carry forward that great policy.

Mr. President, I speak of this amendment as the oil-for-education amendment. Some persons have spoken of it as the Hill amendment. I want to say that the amendment has 35 sponsors.

We sat here a little earlier this afternoon and were moved by the beautiful and richly deserved tributes paid to our great former colleague, the Senator from New Hampshire, Charles Tobey. This amendment had no more devoted advocate than Charles Tobey. I should like to think that this amendment will stand through the years as a testimonial to the vision and the faith of Charles Tobey. He was one of the original 11 sponsors of this amendment. In season and out of season he fought the battle for the amendment.

Mr. President, I know Senators wish to vote. I shall not delay them longer, except to say: Let us stand fast. Let the Senate be true to the stature, the position, the dignity, and the equal rights of the Senate in our legislative processes. Let the Senate be true to the teachers all over the land. Let the Senate keep faith with our school children and with the mothers and fathers of those children, and keep faith with our country, and insist that the House at least take a vote on this amendment, a vote which we know has never been taken. Let us stand today for our children and for our country and insist that the House speak on this amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I desire to confirm everything the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has said this afternoon in his effort to have the Senate reject this conference report. I rise to oppose acceptance by the Senate of the conference report on the Continental Shelf bill. I refused to sign the conference report because I thought it was absolutely wrong for 6 Members of the House to feel that they should ask the Senate conferees to recede from this amendment when it had been agreed to by the Senate with a very substantial majority voting in favor of it.

The very first of the reasons why I feel the House of Representatives should not

take this attitude is that they themselves, as pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, have never voted on the question. It seems to me they should exercise the same democratic principles in the House that we exercise in the Senate. The House conferees should have taken the issue to the House for a vote before expecting the Senate conferees to recede.

Even if I did not feel so strongly on this matter, I would favor this body rejecting the conference report and insisting that not six Representatives in conference, but the entire House of Representatives, act on this important matter before serious consideration is given to receding, if that proves necessary.

It is my opinion that if we stand firm on this matter the question will be submitted to the House floor and the Hill amendment will be adopted.

Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss the merits of the Hill amendment at great length at this time. There has been an extended discussion of it in times past during this session. My views were expressed in Report No. 133, part 2, the minority report on Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Part 4 of that document is a thorough discussion of the educational crisis in the United States, of the need for buildings, higher teachers pay and more teachers, and of the need for more chemists, more engineers, and many more technicians to assure our national security.

The senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] a month ago called attention to the fact that Soviet Russia is now producing more trained technicians, more scientists, than the United States. Yet the condition of our schools, which should be improving to meet this situation, is growing worse instead.

A large percentage of our colleges are operating in the red, although tuitions are so high that they are making higher education unavailable to many of our youth.

The possibility of meeting the educational emergency out of appropriated funds has never been so little. The United States has necessarily shouldered large commitments abroad. We are making large defense expenditures which have been reduced—some of us believe, at least—further than they should have been reduced for national security, in our efforts to balance the budget.

Despite our efforts to balance the budget at this session of the Congress, we have ended fiscal 1953 with a \$9 billion deficit and the Senator from Virginia foresees another deficit next year of \$10 billion if we retain all present taxes or \$14 billion if taxes scheduled to expire January 1 are not reenacted.

Consequently there seems little possibility that adequate sums, can be obtained from tax revenues and normal sources adequately to meet educational needs.

The setting aside of revenues from land and natural resources is no new policy in this Nation. It has been done since before the Constitution was adopted, in 1780, when the Continental Congress dedicated the public lands in

the West to education. There have been 160 such measures since.

Mr. President, I declined to sign this conference report, because I do not feel that it is proper for the Senate to supinely bow to the will of anything less than the full membership of the House of Representatives on so vital an issue. It then seemed to me inconceivable—as it does now—that the Senate would fail to insist on the Hill amendment being voted upon by the full House.

I repeat, that while the House conferees have arbitrarily refused without reason to submit the matter to a vote of the full House up to this time, I am convinced that upon the insistence of the Senate they will see the justice of our position and will take the matter to the House.

The program envisaged by the Hill amendment is backed by the people of this country and is absolutely necessary for the stabilization of our American educational system.

I therefore strongly oppose Senate acceptance of the conference report.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I desire to speak very briefly on this subject. To me, the action of the House conferees comes as a shock and disappointment. The bill was passed by the Senate by a vote of 45 to 37, showing the sentiment in the Senate regarding this very wise and very necessary measure. Now, merely because six conferees of the House, meeting with our conferees, refused to consider the Hill amendment, we are deprived of any possibility of enjoying the benefits of the amendment this year.

Mr. President, in this country we lack teachers; we lack schoolhouses, and our teachers are grossly underpaid. It was demonstrated on the floor of the Senate by authoritative sources that the average teacher, even in States which are reasonably prosperous, receives less than do vermin exterminators, attendants in restrooms, garbage collectors, and the most unskilled forms of common labor. Despite the fact that one cannot become a teacher with adequate training without going through years of training and experience, still teachers receive completely inadequate compensation.

But the main difficulty and main risk in what is being done today lies in the fact that during the past year the school population of this country increased 1 million over last year's enrollment. One million more children entered the public schools of this country than entered a year ago. The best estimates that can be obtained, and I know they come from reliable sources, is that the school population of the United States will increase by 1 million a year for the next 5, 6, or 7 years. What will we do with those children? Shall we simply say, "We cannot give you an education, despite the fact that we have boasted that education is the greatest asset this country has or possibly could have?"

We know there is a tremendous shortage of engineers, doctors, nurses, and dentists, and of trained persons in various other professions. We know, too, that today a well-educated farmer is a far better farmer than an uneducated

one. We know he is able to use all the scientific methods that are taught in agricultural schools and extension courses, which could not be made available to him unless there were sufficient funds.

We know that in every walk of life education plays a tremendous role, and prepares people for a better life and to be a far greater asset in the national economy than if they remain uneducated.

I strongly concur in the recommendation and plea that the Senate disagree to the report and return it to the House. If that is done, I think consideration must be given to the fact that the Hill amendment was agreed to in the Senate by a vote of 45 to 37, far more than a majority, and that we shall have the conference report come back to us, containing this very wise and necessary amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, when the Senate has completed its consideration of the conference report on the outer Continental Shelf bill, it is proposed to have a call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, from the point where we last left off, not from the beginning of the calendar. We would start on page 9 of today's calendar with Order No. 647, and go through to the end of the printed calendar of today.

I understand there were 2 or 3 bills which by agreement on the last call of the calendar, were to be taken up today.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Three bills were carried over by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). They are Calendar No. 617, Senate bill 2038; Calendar No. 620, Senate bill 2231; and Calendar No. 645, H. R. 4483.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Calendar Nos. 617, 620, and 645. The other day, when we thought we might have a calendar call yesterday, which we did not have, I announced we would stop the call of the calendar at the end of that day's calendar, because with reference to the bills which had been reported subsequently the bills and reports themselves would not be ready.

I have been informed by the clerks at the desk that the bills and reports are now available to the end of today's calendar. However, if by chance the minority calendar committee, because they thought we would stop at an earlier point, believes that it would be inconvenient to go that far, because it did not have an opportunity to study the bills, I would have no objection to stopping at a point not that far on the calendar. I would suggest that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] inform me later in the day with respect to that point.

REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE PASSAGE OF BYRNES-WILEY AMENDMENT FOR WISCONSIN RETIREMENT FUND

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at this morning's session of the Senate Finance

I respectfully say that when the Presiding Officer of the Senate ruled that the point of order was well taken, in that the amendment was legislation on an appropriation bill, that was a ruling to which the Senate acceded by not sustaining an appeal, if one had been made, from the ruling of the Chair or in not agreeing to a motion to suspend the rule, if such a motion had been made. Of course, a two-thirds vote is required in order to carry such a motion. I point out, however, that no appeal was taken from the decision of the Chair, and no motion was made to suspend the rule.

Therefore, I say that when that bill went back to conference, there was no handle in it, either in the House language or in the Senate language, which in my judgment would justify the conferees in making any recommendation in regard to these two offices.

When they did it, in my judgment they acted beyond their power as conferees, as regards taking any action that would be to any extent whatever binding upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

If it is agreed that it is not binding upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, then what is the purpose of the recommendation? I am very kindly about it, Mr. President. The purpose of the recommendation is to serve notice on the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of what the Members of Congress who serve on this committee think about it. I do not care what it is called—a rose by any other name smells the same—but, in effect, it amounts to exerting political pressure upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Perhaps the proposed step should be taken; I do not know. It may very well be that after I heard the evidence, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I would join in a recommendation that Reorganization Plan No. 5 be changed. But I wish to hear the evidence before the committee which has legislative jurisdiction.

Therefore, I say I do not think it was right for the conferees to make this kind of recommendation, knowing very well that we have put the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in a rather tough spot—getting them in between one group which says, "You should do it" and another group which says, "Just a minute; wait until we consider Reorganization Plan No. 5, through the legislative process, in the committee which has jurisdiction over substantive legislation affecting the District of Columbia."

I agree with the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. CASE) that probably it would be impossible to reconcile Mr. Spencer's conversation with the Senator from South Dakota with his conversation with the Senator from Oregon—thus proving my point about what happens when such situations develop, and when a conference committee, without any legislative mandate from the Senate, proceeds to make a recommendation which I believe is entirely beyond the

jurisdiction of the conferees, on the basis I have stated.

I do not know the facts about Mr. Fowler and Mr. Lowe. I have never met either of them. I have not been on the Committee on the District of Columbia long enough to have formed any judgment as to how Reorganization Plan No. 5 is working. But again I say that if the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are not competent and capable of carrying out the functions and purposes of Reorganization Plan No. 5 without interference from the Members of Congress, we had better get some new Commissioners. I do not think we ought to be setting a precedent whereby we weaken the development of home rule; rather, we ought to extend the development of home rule. We ought to say to the District Commissioners, "It is your job to run the city."

When they took the position which they took last Saturday, and when I was advised that they thought it would be very unwise to leave this language in the appropriation bill, I made a point of order for what purpose? I had various reasons for doing it. I did not like the whole procedure, for one thing. Secondly, I wanted to protect the rules of the Senate. But I also wanted to protect the jurisdiction of the District Commissioners. I did not think we ought to be giving them directions in an appropriation bill.

Mr. President, as to whether we might lose the services of Mr. Fowler, if he cannot have his way, I may say I have been in the position of an employer, and whenever I found a person who took the position that if he could not have his way, who would use the threat of resignation as a means of getting his way, I always handed him a blank piece of paper and suggested that, on that paper, he could write his resignation. I now suggest that to Mr. Fowler. If it is Mr. Fowler's position that he is going to quit if he cannot have his own way, then I would welcome his resignation. If, on the other hand, come this fall, or earlier, if the chairman of the committee wants to go into the question and hearings are held before the Committee on the District of Columbia, and it can be shown on the merits that this office ought to be modified in accordance with the recommendation of the conferees, I shall be found voting for it.

In the meantime, I say to the District Commissioners, I think they are going to put themselves in an impossible and indefensible situation if they take the position now that, although as recently as last Saturday they did not want this change, now, because they received this recommendation from some Members of Congress on the Hill, they are going to yield to the recommendation, they will cause a great loss of confidence in their ability, in my judgment, to administer the reorganization plan in accordance with what I assumed was their honest judgment last Saturday, when they took the public position they assumed regarding these two offices.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn to a very brief comment on the pending measure. In my judgment, the conference report should go back to conference, and if the Hill amendment cannot be reinstated in the bill, I think it better that we pass no legislation at all, because I assume that we shall probably be coming back before January 1. But if we should not return until then, that would be soon enough to take action on any Continental Shelf bill, if we cannot protect what I think are the great educational values and interests involved in the Hill amendment. But I have a suspicion, Mr. President—or shall I say a hunch, or shall I say I am willing to risk a guess?—that if the administration insists on taking some action between now and January 1 on the proposal to increase the debt ceiling, we shall probably be doing that along next October, in another session. I mean we shall be considering it; not doing it. We shall be considering it along next October, unless we reconvene for that purpose.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say October?

Mr. MORSE. I said I thought that if we were going to consider the debt ceiling, we would probably be doing it about next October.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I say we shall probably be. It is my guess, as I said, that we shall probably be recessing or adjourning to a time in the near future, to come back for the purpose of considering the debt-ceiling proposal, which is going to require extensive and prolonged hearings and debate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does not the Senator think most emphatically that the Senate should know where the money is to go, if there is to be an increased debt ceiling?

Mr. MORSE. That is merely one of the questions. There is a long list of them, a list as long as my arm, which I shall want to know about and shall want to have answered.

Mr. MAYBANK. But the Senator will agree, will he not, that that is one of the questions?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, a very important one; and I want to suggest today, Mr. President, as I said yesterday, that in round numbers there are approximately \$80 billions of unspent funds, and large amounts of money to lend, also unobligated. The President has the power to

impound those funds if it becomes necessary in order to prevent their expenditures, and in order to prevent exceeding the ceiling. That is ample protection, until we can get back to the Senate in October, if conditions turn out to be as fiscally dark as, apparently, Mr. Humphrey has been indicating today.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I make the suggestion that, if the situation requires either that we raise the debt ceiling or that we scale down certain appropriations already made, I am in favor of recalling the appropriations that we may take another look at them. It is better that we appropriate less than that we raise the debt ceiling because of the scary picture the press says Mr. Humphrey pointed out about what would happen by way of a panic if we did not have the money to cover obligations.

There is a corollary to that, too. If the debt ceiling is raised, with the economic situation of the country what it is at this hour, it will again open the floodgates of inflation, and the result will be a panic of a different economic sort.

I think we are right up against the gun. This is the time to hold and hold, and hold, economically speaking. It is the time to say, "No more debt; we will recall these appropriations; we will take another look at them and scale them down, if necessary, in order to prevent the raising of the debt ceiling." I believe that would be one of the best lessons we could teach the world as to democratic processes, and what self-government means when it comes to protecting the economic stability and soundness of our country.

So, Mr. President, I say that, with that issue still ahead, we have plenty of time to consider the Continental Shelf bill, either in October or next January—and better that we not pass it at all than that we eliminate the Hill amendment.

I have discussed this subject so many times in the speeches I have made that it would certainly be repetitious if I were to dwell on it at any length, but by way of argument, all I want to do is to insert in the RECORD a letter which I wrote to the editor of a newspaper in the State of Oregon who differed with me in regard to the Hill amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In your editorial of July 3, entitled "Oil for Education" you minimize the importance of the Hill oil-for-education amendment to the outer Continental Shelf bill, both of which passed the Senate recently.

The oil-for-education amendment is not a "pious gesture" as you characterize it to be. It provides that Federal revenues from the outer Continental Shelf shall be "held in a special account during the present national emergency and, until the Congress shall otherwise provide, the moneys in such special account shall be used only for such urgent developments essential to the national defense and national security as the Congress may determine and thereafter shall be used exclusively as grants in aid of primary, secondary, and higher education."

By this language the amendment dedicates the potentially vast Federal revenues from outer Continental Shelf oil and minerals to grants in aid to education throughout the United States. It creates a trust fund for generations to come. By placing these funds in trust, the amendment insures that needed legislation for school construction, better pay for teachers, improved equipment, and other sorely needed assistance will be voted by future Congresses.

In recent Congresses grants in aid to education have been made only for so-called federally impacted areas, that is, those where Army and defense-plant installations have created school problems beyond the means of local communities. But attempts to apply that pattern to the overcrowded, understaffed schools throughout the United States have been defeated by the injection of divisive and poorly grounded arguments. For instance, religious issues have been used to oppose support for Federal aid to education and to pit group against group in a manner and on an issue which should have no place in a democracy such as ours.

With a trust fund specifically dedicated to education, these tactics would be less effective and probably could be overcome.

Your editorial states, "There is involved, too, the big question whether Federal aid to education is desirable at all, bearing in mind the probability that control will go hand in hand with help."

It should be pointed out that since 1787, when the famous Northwest Ordinance was enacted, Federal assistance has been given to local education. The Morrill Act is another piece of Federal legislation providing aid to schools from the Federal Government. Almost every State in the Union has a State college or university which has received Federal land grants.

It is significant that none of this Federal aid has resulted in interference with local control of education.

The system of grants-in-aid to the States has been used for many important social programs, with appropriate emphasis upon local autonomy.

The Hill amendment, far from being a mere gesture, would be a great, historic, and progressive step.

The recent tidelands giveaway to a few coastal States resulted from the cynical campaign promises made during the election crusade. It cost the people of the United States well over \$50 billion, which could have been devoted to extraordinary defense expenditures and education. The Hill amendment, had it been added to the Tidelands Act, would have been the most practical means of reducing the cost of defense to the American taxpayer.

Unfortunately, the people of the United States were not aware of the serious results of the tidelands giveaway until it was too late, despite the fact that the Supreme Court held three times that the Federal Government had paramount jurisdiction over the area and that the coastal State claims were invalid.

By tying the outer Continental Shelf revenues to aid-to-education, the American people would be taking out an insurance policy that no new land grab on the Continental Shelf would take place. The parents and teachers of America would help see to that.

This bill went to conference on July 20. The House bill does not contain the Hill amendment, so that the conferees of both Houses must agree to its inclusion in the bill. If they do, the House of Representatives must adopt its conferees' action.

Conferees who voted against the Hill amendment in the Senate were: HUGH BUTLER, Republican, of Nebraska; GUY COR-

DON, Republican, of Oregon; EUGENE MILLIKIN, Republican, of Colorado.

House conferees are: LOUIS E. GRAHAM, Republican, of Pennsylvania; PATRICK J. HILLINGS, Republican, of California; WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, Republican, of Ohio; RUTH THOMPSON, Republican, of Michigan; EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York; FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and J. FRANK WILSON, Democrat, of Texas.

I am writing this letter to you for publication so that your readers may have an opportunity to learn about both sides of the question.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, by way of argument, I desire to read but a few paragraphs of the letter. Like most of my speeches, it is a rather lengthy letter, and I shall not read it in its entirety. But in the letter I said:

In your editorial of July 3, entitled "Oil for Education" you minimize the importance of the Hill oil-for-education amendment to the outer Continental Shelf bill, both of which passed the Senate recently.

The oil-for-education amendment is not a "pious gesture" as you characterize it to be. It provides that Federal revenue from the outer Continental Shelf shall be "held in a special account during the present national emergency and, until the Congress shall otherwise provide, the moneys in such special account shall be used only for such urgent developments essential to the national defense and national security as the Congress may determine and thereafter shall be used exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education."

By this language the amendment dedicates the potentially vast Federal revenues from outer Continental Shelf oil and minerals to grants-in-aid to education throughout the United States. It creates a trust fund for generations to come. By placing these funds in trust, the amendment insures that needed legislation for school construction, better pay for teachers, improved equipment and other sorely needed assistance will be voted by future Congresses.

In recent Congresses grants-in-aid to education have been made only for so-called federally impacted areas, that is, those where Army and defense plant installations have created school problems beyond the means of local communities. But attempts to apply that pattern to the overcrowded, understaffed schools throughout the United States have been defeated by the injection of divisive and poorly grounded arguments. For instance, religious issues have been used to oppose support for Federal aid to education and to pit group against group in a manner and on an issue which should have no place in a democracy such as ours.

With a trust fund specifically dedicated to education, these tactics would be less effective and probably could be overcome.

Your editorial states "There is involved, too, the big question whether Federal aid to education is desirable at all, bearing in mind the probability that control will go hand in hand with help."

It should be pointed out that since 1787, when the famous Northwest Ordinance was enacted, Federal assistance has been given to local education. The Morrill Act is another piece of Federal legislation providing aid to schools from the Federal Government. Almost every State in the Union has State college or university which has received Federal land grants.

It is significant that none of this Federal aid has resulted in interference with local control of education.

The system of grants-in-aid to the States has been used for many important social programs with appropriate emphasis upon local autonomy.

The Hill amendment, far from being a "mere gesture," would be a great, historic, and progressive step.

Mr. President, I say to the people of my State that what we ought to do is to place the money in trust. Certainly it is to be implemented later by the Federal aid to education legislative program, but the important thing is to preserve and to conserve these funds in trust for the school children of America until such time as Congress will be able to give due deliberation to various proposals for implementing the Federal aid to education legislative enactment.

TREES, NATURE, AND MEN OF THE SOUTH

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the industrial revolution which is taking place in the new South is a dynamic factor in the economic well-being of our entire Nation. On June 10 I spoke to you about some of the tremendous strides that have been made—of the courage, the self-reliance, the independent initiative which have marked the progress of the South's business and industrial growth. And I spoke to you about the textile industry—of how the spindles of progress within that industry are turning to provide opportunities for thousands of workers and hundreds of communities.

Today I should like to speak further about the new South. I should like to tell of another industry that is proving an example and an inspiration to Americans everywhere. For the next few minutes I should like to speak about an industry that refused to die.

This industry is one which was marked for the grave not many decades ago. The economic doctors of those earlier years said that there was no hope—that the patient was disintegrating to nothingness and would never lead a healthy life again.

The patient of which I speak is the lumber industry—today one of the strongest, soundest, most agile industries in the South.

Now operating 34 percent of all industrial plants in the South, southern lumber manufacturing is one of the finest examples anywhere of an industry that has, of its own initiative and foresight, made itself a healthy and growing part of our Nation's economic advancement.

Let us go back for a few moments and see how this industry met its challenges. Let us examine the history of southern lumbering. It is a lesson from which other industries—and other regions—can profit. For the southern lumber industry is a prime example of business foresight combined with self-rejuvenation.

Forests and their products have been among our most precious assets in the South for many years. In the old days they provided our forefathers with shelter and fuel, plus some products for sale

or trade. Our woods in the Southeast were the home of the original "tar heels," and for generations tar, pitch, and turpentine were among the major contributions of this era to national and world commerce. In fact, it is a matter of historical record that the first ship returning from Jamestown to London in 1608 included in its cargo pitch, tar, clapboard, and wainscot. That was the birth of America's export lumber trade.

Not many years later the first real sawmill in this country was built. It was set up at a waterfall near Richmond more than three centuries ago. What a long way the lumber industry has come since then.

Most of the early pioneers that settled in this country did not consider the forests as a great natural resource; in fact, to them, the forests were actually a barrier. They were interested in cutting away the trees so that they could have land for farming, for homes and stock-ades.

In later years, when the forest lands were used more and more for lumber operations, it was only natural that the forests should be regarded as inexhaustible. Sawmill operators and loggers of those early years had no worry about timber supply. They knew that when they had cut out the forests at one location there was always another supply of trees a little farther on.

Crude logging practices and indiscriminate burning of the woods for grazing led to the assumption that the South's timberland would soon be depleted. Just after the beginning of this century economists, hard-headed businessmen, conservationists, and even some of the timber owners talked with all sincerity about the South's disappearing forests.

Here is what one of them had to say:

There has been so much capitalistic exploitation of southern forests that in another decade southern forest land will be barren. The cut of southern pine is falling off and before long the merchantable timber will not even be enough to fill the requirements of the Southern States themselves.

Many of the lumbermen transferred their operations to the west coast, but others decided to wait and work and see what the trees would do.

The little trees did not let them down. They took root. They spread their branches and covered the barren land from which the older trees had been cut away.

Far from being depleted, the forests of the South today are supplying a greater volume and far greater value of wood products than they have ever yielded. During the past several decades, southern lumbermen have allied themselves with nature to grow and protect the trees, while at the same time selectively cutting a very substantial share of the Nation's forest products. Not only did they nurse an ailing industry back to good health, they have made it one of the most robust industries in the Nation.

The record stands out boldly that the men who predicted forest famine in the South overlooked one important point—

the fact that trees grow. They seemed to overlook the fact that trees are not mined like coal and copper, but are harvested, like cotton and corn. Trees, like any agricultural crop, can be harvested again and again. When one is cut, another can be grown in its place.

It will be no surprise to those among us who have eyes to see and ears to hear to be reminded that forest products have achieved a place of major importance in the new South. The real testimonial lies, of course, in the forests of the South, which today supply about two-fifths of the Nation's lumber. Today more than 183 million acres of southern land is forested. This makes the South the largest commercial forest area of our Nation. Nearly three-fifths of the total area of some of our States are covered with forest growth. This compares with forests covering less than one-fourth of the United States as a whole. Twelve of our Southern States, comprising only 18 percent of the total land area of our Nation, contain 40 percent of the country's commercial forest land.

Among the most striking examples of heavily forested States are Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, whose combined forest areas of nearly 70 million acres represent a ratio of almost 3 acres of woods to every 5 acres in the area.

Especially heavily forested are the wondrous Appalachian Highlands and the Lower Coastal Plain in South Carolina. Other extensive forest areas are found in a wide belt stretching from Virginia to east Texas. This is the area in which southern pine is grown. Southern pine constitutes about 30 percent of all lumber used in the United States.

From the vast forests of the South come nearly 40 percent of the Nation's lumber products and 60 percent of America's pulpwood. Southern forests also provide 100 percent of the naval stores produced in this Nation.

Worn out? Depleted? Far from it when the southern region leads the Nation in forest commodities, as it does today.

They said the patient would die. Yet, still standing in the southern forests are some 338 billion board feet of sawtimber—more than half of it Southern Pine. This sawtimber volume is equivalent to 25 times the average annual lumber production in the South for the past 10 years. Moreover, the Southern Pine sawtimber is growing at a rate of almost 34 million board feet every day. This means that at exactly this time tomorrow we will have added 34 million board feet of new sawtimber to the South's wooded warehouse. In other words, during the next 24 hours enough new growth will be added to Southern Pine trees to build 3,400 average American homes.

Trees are a renewable resource. That is one of the factors which gives the South an advantage. Partly because of climate and partly because of the soil, our area contains some of the fastest-growing forests of the world. Our Southern Pine trees grow to pulpwood size in

available will materially reduce the volume of young trees harvested annually as pulpwood. This is just one of the many ways southern lumber manufacturers have used their own ingenuity and foresight in bettering their industry and making a natural resource more effective in its service to mankind.

Another of the great advancements resulting from the lumber industry's efforts to improve the effective utilization of its product has been in the development of glued-laminated lumber—the production of large-sized beams and arches by gluing together pieces of smaller size. It is now possible to build up strong wood beams, trusses, and arches of practically unlimited size and shape by gluing small pieces together.

As I pointed out earlier, southern forests yield 60 percent of the Nation's pulpwood. To an increasing extent the paper and lumber industries are working together to achieve efficient utilization of the timber supply.

The pulp and paper industry owns an estimated 9 million acres of forest land in the South. As I indicated earlier in this speech, close to 90 percent of the industry's requirements are being cut from other lands, most of which are in farm ownership.

Pulpwood production in this area has been sharply upward since the 1930's. There is much reason to anticipate further increases, for we as a nation import large amounts of this material from Canada and even from overseas, sometimes at very high prices.

The 68 pulp and paper mills of the South include 4 new and modern newsprint mills, capable of producing about 200,000 tons of newsprint each year. This is about 20 percent of the newsprint manufacturing capacity of the United States, but less than 4 percent of the amount annually consumed in this country. Most southern mills produce what is known as Kraft paper, and the entire production of our pulp and paper mills is in the neighborhood of 9 million tons, worth more than \$2 billion.

A study by McLaughlin and Robock shows that, of all the new manufacturing enterprises involving investment of more than \$100,000 which have been started in the South, "probably the largest completely new postwar enterprise was the Coosa River Newsprint Co., a \$10,000,000 plant which was sponsored and financed by southern newspaper publishers who acquired a Government-owned ordnance plant at Childersburg, Ala."—Glenn E. McLaughlin and Stefan Robock, *Why Industry Moves South—A Study of Factors Influencing the Recent Location of Manufacturing Plants in the South*, Committee of the South, National Planning Association, 1949, 148 pages.

In the efforts to lengthen the useful life of food and thus conserve it, no single effort is more worthy of consideration than the extensive preservative treatment of poles for use by rural-electrification lines in many parts of the country. A specific illustration of this is the new wood-processing plant of the American Lumber and Treating Co. at Florence, S. C. The South Carolina plant is double the capacity of the earlier one,

and serves as a service station to process lumber, poles, timbers, and ties for others. The development cost about three-fourths of a million dollars and employs nearly 200 men.

We can well see how much the forest products industries have meant to the economy of the South. If southern lumbermen had thrown up their hands in helplessness during those gloomy days of a few dozen years ago, or if they had shirked in a let-George-do-it attitude, the New South would not be in as strong a position as it is in today. Instead, they put their hands to work, pulled on the bootstraps themselves, and the results can be readily seen.

There are ghost towns no more in the South. The lumber communities—and you can observe them everywhere—are thriving towns whose livelihoods are based on a permanent industry. The lumber mills are providing payrolls that help support the merchants, the doctors, the lawyers, the ministers, and the laborers in hundreds of the busy lumber communities. And outside of town, in the country-side, the forests are providing cash crops to thousands of landowners.

More than 369,000 southerners are directly employed in the production of lumber and timber basic products, making the industry second only to textiles. This amounts to 15 percent of all industrial employees in the South. In the number of active plants, the lumber industry ranks first, with 17,561 mills. The annual payroll amounts to \$958 million. Certainly, the forests are making an active contribution to the South's economic prosperity.

Trees have been growing in the South for millions of years. During most of this time, the trees grew through their regular cycle, reaching maturity, dying, falling uselessly into decay. They were of no service.

Now, however, the trees of the South are making an overwhelming contribution to the people of this land. They are serving us in the building of homes, schools, churches, and factories. And they are supplying raw materials for industry. They are fulfilling their destiny.

We know that there will always be plenty of trees for this great industry in the South. Moreover, we know that the present and future of the industry is in good hands. For man is working with nature to make the achievements of southern lumbering possible. Nature and man are working hand in hand to grow more trees—and to put the trees to good use.

Only a generation ago, southern lumbermen urged their sons and grandsons to seek their goals in life through the professions or in other businesses or even in other regions. That was a time when there was a feeling that the forest industries of the South offered less in the way of permanence or stability. But today the young men are remaining in the industry. They are finding new opportunity for enterprise and progress.

The South is growing crops of new trees. The South also is growing and retaining men with the vision to put those trees to work for mankind.

Now Mr. President, my reason for having spoken at this time is that there was reported from the Banking and Currency Committee today a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] providing that national banks be authorized to make loans on standing timber. National banks may make loans under this bill, in the forest areas of the West or South, or wherever such loans are needed. So far as the Southeast is concerned, many representatives of the sawmill business, the logging business, the pulp business, and timber owners have written me urging that the bill be passed. I believe it is proper for national banks to be permitted to make loans to this great industry, and I hope the bill will be enacted without delay.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina for his very fine remarks and his recital of the very interesting facts with reference to the tree industry in the South, particularly the Southeast, and for his urging passage of the bill to extend credit to timber growers. Credit is one of the great needs of our area. I think long-term credit for our timberland is one of the benefits to which we can look forward.

Mr. MAYBANK. I notice the senior Senator from Oregon on the floor. I wonder if I may have his attention. I was speaking of the necessity of the passage of the bill the Senator from Oregon has introduced, which permits national banks to make loans on standing timber. I made a speech previously on the lumber industry in the Southeast?

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I know the matter is one of very real importance all over the timber areas of the South, as it is in the West.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the interest of the Senator from Oregon in the South.

Mr. MAYBANK. Money is hard to get today.

Mr. STENNIS. As the Senator knows, a forest does not yield income for many years. Lumbering is an industry requiring long-term credit. Fortunately, some oil and gas has been discovered in Mississippi, but I have said many times that long after they are gone, the pine trees will still be furnishing thousands and thousands of men and women a livelihood.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the senior Senator from South Carolina in this worthy cause, and I commend him for the speech he has just made.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of con-

ference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend the Submerged Lands Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ives in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am never very anxious to take the time of the Senate to inflict my views on Senators. My only reason for taking time to speak on the conference report is that during the course of my membership in the House and the Senate, I have built up something of a record with regard to devoting and dedicating a portion of the revenues from the Continental Shelf to the cause of education.

During the debate on the bill when it was before the Senate, it was my privilege, in the absence of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], to present an amendment, in behalf of myself and him, proposing the dedication of revenues from the Continental Shelf on a per capita basis. I may say that my own feeling is that had that approach been used throughout the history of the cause, we might be further along than we are now.

The trouble is that when the method which will be used for distribution is left, we permit all the specters and bogies of Federal control of education to defeat the basic objective. Now we have arrived at a very difficult situation, namely, whether, facing the adjournment of Congress, we wish to permit the uncertain status of the potential revenues of the Continental Shelf to continue in an uncertain status, and possibly to have rights developed or claims accrue which would plague us in any future action.

Because of that, a difficult question is presented to those of us who have felt there may have been a legitimate, effective, and productive dedication of these revenues, while, at the same time, we did not wish the resources to be claimed either by the States or by interests which might establish some priority of use.

In my own case, the whole matter is related to the Louisiana Purchase and the place of my State in the Louisiana Purchase. It happened that the day we were voting on the bill, or were discussing it preparatory to a vote in the Senate, was the 150th anniversary of the signing of the Louisiana Purchase. In observance of the anniversary, the Governor of my State, Sigurd Anderson, called upon Badger Clark, poet laureate of South Dakota, to write a poem to commemorate the Louisiana Purchase.

Mr. Clark is a writer generally of western verse, but he did write a poem, and he wrote in the colloquialism of "A Commonsensical Yankee of 1803," the year of the Louisiana Purchase. Because of its collateral relationship, and because it is not very long, and because it might offer a little diversion at a time when many Senators are at dinner, I shall read the poem. I think it ought to be a part of the story because, when all is said and

done, it bears perfectly upon the issue involved. This is the poem:

THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE

(By a "commonsensical" Yankee of 1803)

Old Tom Jefferson, what do you mean,
Buying up land that we've never seen,
All Louisiana for a whopping sum,
From the Mississippi River to Kingdom
Come?

And we only know that there's rain and snow
And grass and Injuns and buffalo.

Old Tom Jefferson, what's it worth,
A desert half-way around the earth,
A thousand miles from a road or track?
How do you get there and how get back?
Your horse might skip and your keel-boat
zip

But you'd still grow old and die on the trip.

Old Tom Jefferson, it's too far away.
Only miracles could make it pay—
Ships that sail against a river's power
Wagons that go 20 miles an hour—
And the pioneers on our old frontiers
Won't get it settled in a thousand years.

Old Tom Jefferson, I tell you what,
Little New Orleans was all you got—
Fifteen million for the soggy port
And the rest thrown in for a bit of sport.
The Frenchies knew when the deal went
through

That Napoleon had bamboozled you.

Old Tom Jefferson, we'll never see
Your wild Stony Mountain, wherever they
be,
And your buffalo pastures may just do
For a place to banish our rascals to.
You've paid a lot for we don't know what,
And our 15 million has gone to pot.

Old Tom Jefferson, once you shone,
Jarred the footings of the British throne,
Shaped the Declaration with your hand,
Trumpeted the liberty through the land,
So for old times' sake, in this big mistake
We'll forgive a good man, one bad break.

—Badger Clark.

After all, that represented the opinion of a great many people in the United States in 1803. It was similar to the purchase of Alaska, which was later described as Seward's Folly. The questionable authority the President had in 1803 for the negotiation of the purchase made even Tom Jefferson pause before he put his name or authorized the signing of the purchase agreement.

But the fears of that day disappeared. The mountains were reached. New Orleans, "the old soggy port" the poet speaks of, was not all we got. We got a great part of the middle mass of the continent which today constitutes a vast part of the Nation.

Now we have the Continental Shelf. In 1803 no one dreamed that the Continental Shelf might have great potential values. I should like to see the revenues from the Continental Shelf dedicated to the cause of education, much as we dedicated portions of land in sections 16 and 36 throughout many of the States of the Northwest to the cause of education.

I introduced a bill on this subject in the House of Representatives in 1949. I reintroduced the proposed legislation in the Senate. I have constantly voted for every measure that proposed to accomplish this purpose.

At the same time, and by the same token, I felt that the Louisiana Purchase

was a part of the whole United States I feel that my State of South Dakota and the States of Missouri, Kansas, North Dakota, and portions of Wyoming and Montana, have a right to share in the resources developed in the Gulf of Mexico, to the extent that they have come to us by reason of the Louisiana Purchase.

I am reluctant to accept the situation which we have now, a situation in which, if we do not do something now, we shall not get a Continental Shelf bill. In other words, the ownership of the Continental Shelf might again be claimed by the States immediately adjoining. Rights might be asserted or claims might be made by those who have been prospecting there or those who, by use of one sort or another, seek to establish certain claims. So, very reluctantly, I have come to the conclusion that in this situation I shall have to vote to adopt the conference report; but in so doing I wish to state for the Record that I expect to use what ever energy I have and whatever efforts I can bring to bear, to join with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and with other Senators, I hope, in dedicating a portion of the receipts—even though we do not do it in this bill—to the cause of education, and providing for their distribution on a per capita basis or some other definite, certain basis, so that the spectre of Federal control will not block the success of the measure, as would be the case under the amendment which the Senate adopted.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I commend the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for this very clear expression of his concern and his future intentions. In respect to this report, I certainly will join with him, as he pledges himself to a solution of this problem at some appropriate time later, either in the next session or at some future session of the Congress.

When I was necessarily absent, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota handled the amendment which we had offered together and he put up a valiant fight to have it written into the pending legislation. I think it is unfortunate that that amendment was not adopted. I think if it had been adopted, we all could support the pending conference report with a great deal more enthusiasm and a great deal more confidence. As things now stand, we do not know what will happen to the revenues which are expected from this new source for the Federal Government. Today, as I vote to support this conference report, I vote with great reluctance because of the void which seems to exist as a result of the lack of action with respect to the source of the revenues.

I wish to pay my respects to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who has handled this very difficult legislation so ably and has given us all great confidence in the cause espoused under this legislation.

I wish also to commend the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] for the contribution they have made to this partial solution—and it is only a partial solution—of a very difficult problem.

Mr. CORDON and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If there are no further speeches, I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CORDON. I rose to do that very thing.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Goldwater	Martin
Anderson	Gore	Maybank
Barrett	Green	McCarran
Beall	Griswold	McCarthy
Bennett	Hayden	McClellan
Bricker	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bridges	Hennings	Monroney
Bush	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Murray
Byrd	Holland	Neely
Capehart	Humphrey	Pastore
Carlson	Hunt	Payne
Case	Ives	Potter
Chavez	Jackson	Purtell
Clements	Jenner	Robertson
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kefauver	Smathers
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Kuchel	Stennis
Ellender	Langer	Symington
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Flanders	Lennon	Watkins
Frear	Long	Welker
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Mansfield	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ives in the chair). A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I first want to recognize what I think is the very great wisdom and sense of realism which has been displayed by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in stating that, though they were in support of the aid-for-education amendment, they feel the situation now confronting the Senate is such that they would be derelict to their duty in getting a serious question solved and getting the Federal Government's production started, if they did not support the conference report.

I well recall that one of my distinguished friends a little while ago made the statement that he did not regard the Hill amendment as it now appears on the Senate bill as an idle gesture. I am sure he will pardon me if I differ completely from the conclusion. I believe the Hill amendment as it now appears in the Senate bill is an idle gesture, and above and beyond that it is a positive handicap to the performance of its duties by Congress in bringing to an end the

whole submerged lands question, which has been such a source of anxiety and worry to the Congress and to our people since 1937.

Mr. President, the first point I shall mention is that this question brought up here, namely, the effort to go back to conference, the desire to postpone final action because of the fact that the Hill amendment is not in the conference bill, is delaying settlement, and is injuring the cause of the Nation and is a handicap to our completion of a duty which is a highly important duty.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to something that the Senator from Oregon was too modest to mention, and that is that, except for the discarding of the Hill amendment, the bill as reported by the conferees is a complete victory for the Senate and for the Senate version. That is due almost in whole to the tremendous efforts and the very fine leadership of the Senator from Oregon in spending the months that were involved in the consideration of the two bills, in trying to bring out a sane bill dealing with the outer Continental Shelf, and likewise to the fine devotion of every member of that committee, who, regardless of differences of opinion, worked together those many weeks and months until they came out with a bill which has become the conference bill, except in the matter of the elimination of the Hill amendment, which was not on the bill reported by our committee.

I call attention to the fact that not only was the Hill amendment not on the committee bill, but that hearings were held on the Hill amendment, both in connection with the tidelands bill earlier this year and later on this particular measure.

The distinguished Senator from Alabama, whose name is borne by the Hill amendment, appeared before the committee, and was supported by others from educational groups and labor organization and, in the first hearing, by the Americans for Democratic Action, and various other groups.

The committee in its wisdom eliminated the Hill provision, because it was so clear to the committee, as it must be clear to anyone who will look at the facts, that it has no definite relationship to the subject matter of the whole legislation, and that instead, it is serving as a handicap to prevent earlier action which would come from Congress.

I remind Members of the Senate that, in the first place, we passed the tidelands bill, returning to the States, in addition to other waters and lands, the submerged coastal lands extending from the low-water mark out to the State boundaries.

In the course of that debate it was stated, not once but repeatedly, that there would follow another bill, which is the pending measure, affecting the Continental Shelf, a more important measure, as to its effects, by a great deal than was the tidelands bill.

Why is it more important? First, it covers nine-tenths of the submerged lands between the low-water mark and the edge of the Continental Shelf. In other words, nine-tenths of the area adjoining our coast from one end of the Nation to the other is embraced in the

bill before us. One-tenth of the land lying closest to the shore was contained in the other measure.

In the next place, five-sixths of the assets—that is, the known or estimated assets of oil and gas—and most of them are estimated by our geological experts, although some are known—five-sixths of those assets lie outside the State boundaries and are contained in the area covered in the pending bill, which covers only the outer Continental Shelf.

There were those who had great concern when we passed the tidelands bill, because they thought the Senate and the Congress was without resolution to go ahead and give the Federal Government that which belongs to it and that which the Senator from Florida has contended, ever since he has been a Member of the Senate, belongs to the Federal Government, and to not only recognize the title of the Federal Government but to give it the machinery and the tools and the needed legislation so it can go ahead and develop that which our country needs and that which alone can produce revenue from this great, vast, rich area.

The bill before us will do just that, and it should put always to an end the fears of those who thought there would not be the stern resolution found in the Senate or in the House of Representatives to go ahead and recognize as belonging to the Federal Government that which at least the vast majority claimed in the other debate did belong to the Federal Government, while we were recognizing the special claim by the States to their submerged lands within their boundaries, which historically for 150 years they did claim and did occupy and did use as fully as any use could be made at that time of that land.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It has always seemed to me that those who are opposed to the tidelands bill have recognized that there was an impasse between the President and the Congress. While we had a Democratic administration, both Houses would vote to pass the tidelands bill, and then the President would veto it. Although two-thirds of the Members of the Senate were prepared to pass the bill over the President's veto, two-thirds of the Members of the House would not pass the bill over the President's veto.

But when the bill came up again, some Members of the Senate succeeded in hanging the Hill amendment onto it. The fight over the Hill amendment was older than the fight over the tidelands bill. The Hill amendment was one which the Senate had always been willing to adopt, but which the House had never been willing to adopt.

When the tidelands bill and the Hill amendment were tied together, once again a legislative snag developed. The controversy over it could continue for many years.

Even though I believe some of us in the Senate voted properly in voting against the original bill, I believe we might as well proceed to have development made under Federal management, and thus dispose of one of those ques-

tions, and then at a later time see whether we can persuade the House of Representatives to go along in regard to Federal aid to education.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana. That is a concession which I believe marks him as a realist, as well as a patriot.

Mr. President, I think the situation is anomalous indeed, when we find that the very Senators who opposed passage of the tidelands bill, and who, as one part of their argument, advanced the fear that Congress would never get around to recognizing the rights of the Federal Government in the Continental Shelf, are the identical ones who are holding up action on the Continental Shelf bill, a bill so carefully drawn up by the Senate committee and so carefully acted upon by the Senate that the House has conceded the virtues of the bill and has agreed to it almost in full in the conference report, except for the rejection of the wart which has been placed upon it by means of this amendment which, although well intended, has no more place on the body of this bill—where it will cause great trouble in terms of delaying and perhaps defeating enactment of the bill—than something entirely foreign to the subject matter.

I wish to comment first on the fact that unless the conference report is agreed to, we shall not have any legislation on this subject at this session. It is said there may be a special session later on, or that in any event Congress will be in session again in January. That may be true. Of course, we shall have nothing to do then! If there is a special session, it will be called because the work has piled up upon us so heavily that the country will demand that we return. If we do not return until January, we shall then have confronting us the greatest burden of legislation which I think has ever confronted the second session of any Congress for a long, long time. Yet there are those who would be perfectly willing to let the subject matter rest where it is, unenacted, and would be perfectly willing to delay the production of the oil and gas which belong to the Federal Government, and delay having poured into the coffers of the Federal Government the revenue from those resources, which is most sizable and badly needed. In that connection, I point out that we have on our desks tonight copies of a message from the President, which arrived here only a moment ago. That message relates to the need to raise the limit on the national debt. Yet here is one source of revenue which we have been attempting for a long, long time to have brought into the Federal Treasury. It is now within our grasp, except for the objections of some Members who opposed the tidelands bill and expressed great fear that those of us who favored the tidelands bill would not go along with enactment of the bill relating to the Continental Shelf. That is the anomalous situation which confronts the Senate and the country. In other words, those who are holding up enactment of the Continental Shelf bill are not the ones who supported the tidelands bill.

On the contrary, those who oppose enactment of the Continental Shelf bill are the ones who from the housetops and over the radio and television questioned the good judgment and also the intentions of the Senators who supported the tidelands bill, and asked dubiously whether we would be willing to have a bill relating to the Continental Shelf enacted into law.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As I understand the issue, the only question is whether the revenue from the outer Continental Shelf shall be devoted to education or whether it shall be placed in the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. HOLLAND. No; that is an issue that is proposed to be postponed for 3 years, because the so-called Hill amendment, now included in the Senate bill, provides that for 3 years the revenue will be available for expenditure for purposes of national defense. Even in that case, the revenue will not go into the general fund of the Treasury, but will remain idle until Congress proceeds to say, in effect, "Here is a defense project on which we will spend this money." Until Congress takes such further action, that will be the situation even for the 3 years, during which this important source of revenue will be tied up in the Treasury, which certainly needs some active and live money, but is being deprived of this particular money by the recalcitrance of folks who do not wish to have the Congress enact provision for legislative machinery giving to the Federal Government that which belongs to Uncle Sam.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Florida wishes to call the majority of the Senate recalcitrant, because, as he well knows, the majority of the Senate voted for the Hill amendment.

All we want is to have the House of Representatives given an opportunity, by means of rejection of the conference report, to vote on the proposition, first, that this revenue should be devoted to the national defense and, second, that this revenue should be devoted to education.

If the Senator from Florida can think of any better purpose to which the money could be devoted than the purpose of the defense of the country and, after that, education, I wish he would state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot think of anything better. I am in the fortunate position of having stood on the floor of the Senate and battled for the Federal aid to education bill, and of having gained at that time the high encomiums of my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. Just to complete the record and to preen my feathers a little, I should like to read into the Record a little later the encomiums of me uttered at that time by my good friend, the Senator from Alabama.

But in regard to the point that the House has not passed on this matter, let me say briefly that the now junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], then a Member of the House of Representatives, 2 years ago offered in the

House the Hill amendment to the then pending tidelands bill. A point of order was raised and sustained, under the rules of the House. The measure had not been considered by the committee which should have considered it. The measure had not cleared, as it should. So the point of order was sustained.

So this year, when the matter came up, in order to get the Hill amendment before the House, it was necessary to embrace it in substitute bills, which, if the Senate cares to read them, will be found to differ very little from the bills which have pending here, except in the matter of having the Hill amendment attached.

The first of those bills was a substitute bill introduced by Mr. FEIGHAN on the floor of the House on March 31, 1953. At this time I should like to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to present to the Senate, briefly, his description of that bill. I now read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31, 1953, at page 2546.

Mr. PERKINS. The proposals the gentleman is offering here are identical, I believe, with the Hill proposal that was offered on the Senate side last year?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, fundamentally it is identical, with just a few minor variations.

In the course of the exchange which continued, it was made very clear that the real purpose of the Feighan substitute bill was to get the Hill amendment before the House.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to conclude my statement that—

Mr. KEFAUVER. But I want the Senator from Florida to state that the purpose of the Feighan amendment was to devote to the cause of education all the revenue coming from the area between the 3-mile limit and the 9½ mile limit off the coast of West Florida and Texas.

Mr. HOLLAND. No; the Senator from Tennessee is wrong about that. He is talking now about the Perkins amendment, which I shall mention in a moment.

On the contrary, the Feighan amendment offered to the cause of education only the income from the area outside the State boundaries, as the Senator from Tennessee will see if he cares to read the amendment.

At any rate, what was the result of that debate? I repeat that it is to be found at pages 2546 to 2551 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31, 1953. From that Record we find that on a division demanded by Mr. FEIGHAN, there were 28 ayes and 82 noes. In other words, by a vote of 82 to 28, the House turned down the Feighan amendment, including the Hill amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will be patient, after I conclude my reference to the Feighan amendment, I shall be glad to yield.

Then Mr. FEIGHAN demanded tellers. I understand that in the House of Representatives in order to have a teller count, one-fifth of a quorum must join in the demand for the appointment of

tellers. One hundred and ten Members were present at that time, and it would have been necessary for 20 of the Members to have joined in the demand for the appointment of tellers. However, tellers were not appointed. So it is obvious that not as many as 20 Members of the House at that time, out of the 110 then present, were willing to go on record as demanding a teller vote on the Feighan amendment.

Now I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, since the Senator from Florida is so certain about the attitude of the House of Representatives, why does he object so strenuously to having the conference report returned to a further conference, so that thereafter it would be voted on again by the House of Representatives, where there could be a quick vote? In that way we could see what the House thinks at that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Because the House has been ably represented by its conferees, and I think they know a great deal better than we do what the House wants. When the House conferees had yielded in the great majority of the instances to the Senate, but simply declined to yield on this one matter—which, as I shall show in a few minutes, is a completely unsound and idle gesture—I am not disposed to quarrel with those representing that coordinate body; I am not disposed to question whether they are representing that body carefully and properly. I think they are representing it carefully and properly; certainly I extend that presumption to them. I know of nothing to the contrary.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator must know that the Members of the House of Representatives have been quite as anxious to further the cause of education in the Nation as have the Members of the Senate. The Senator, upon inquiry and appraisal of the vote in the House, must appreciate the fact that the only opportunity the House has had to vote on the question has been with regard to revenue from the entire Continental Shelf, and that the House has never had an opportunity to vote on the revenue immediately outside the 3-mile limit, or the boundaries of the States. So why does the Senator object to giving the House an opportunity to express itself on this particular issue, if he is so certain as to what its attitude is.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida knows that the House of Representatives has been considering this matter since 1937. He knows it has been before the House repeatedly, and that there has been ample opportunity to consider it. He knows what happened to the Feighan amendment, which, as he reads it, has to do with adoption of the Hill amendment, with sufficient similarity in it to our other bills to enable us to know that that was what was presented. The distinguished Representative himself said that. The Senator from Florida does not think we should forego longer the development of the Continental Shelf values. He thinks that those who take

unto themselves the responsibility of denying to our Government, at this critical time in our finances, its rights to proceed immediately to begin the developments which were cut off in 1950, are taking the responsibility of staying the hand of our Nation in a most vital situation and at a most important time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator let me ask a question at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In view of the fact that we are now going to be confronted with an extension of the session for the purpose of enlargement of the debt limit, does not the Senator feel that we might at least get this very important matter of the dedication of the funds from the outer Continental Shelf established by a vote of the House of Representatives? I do not see that the time is so urgent, in view of the fact that the President has asked that we extend the debt limit. We have several days in which this question could be considered. It would take the House only 40 minutes to vote on it. I assume from his argument that the Senator believes if the House voted they would indicate they did not want the funds to be spent for purposes of education, but we who want to do something for the schools of the Nation are very anxious that the House of Representatives at least have an opportunity of voting directly on the issue. Will the Senator not join us in giving the House that opportunity?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida thinks the House has had abundant opportunity to speak on any aspect of this question that it wanted to speak on, and when the House managers expressed the unyielding verdict, for themselves and for the House, that they are satisfied with the conference report, which adopts the Senate bill, the Senator from Florida gives prima facie effect to their position. He thinks that they know the wishes of those whom they represent better than we do.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator think—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield no further just now.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not blame the Senator for not yielding, for this question is one that would be difficult to answer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have yielded for a great many questions, and I intend to yield later, but I desire to continue briefly on the discussion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I decline to yield at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida declines to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Now, on the Perkins bill. On the same day, and just as soon as the verdict of the House was rendered on the Feighan bill, Mr. Perkins introduced a substitute bill, and that bill is set forth in full in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD. Senators may see it if they desire to do so, and they will find that it, too, is an oil-for-education bill, and they will find that it was voted down by a voice vote. There was no demand either for a division vote or for a tally vote, because the House apparently had shown clearly how it felt on that particular question.

Mr. President, I have concluded my reference to the House. If the Senator from Tennessee has questions with reference to either of the two bills to which I referred, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I merely wanted to ask the Senator this question. He said he thought the conferees knew well the opinion of the House. Then why does the Senator fear presenting the matter directly to the House of Representatives?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has no fear about it at all. It would not make a serious difference to him if this measure had passed with the Hill amendment in it, but he thinks it is a bad amendment, because he thinks that anything that is an idle gesture and that holds out a hollow shell to good people is wrong, and he will not be a party to it if he can avoid it; and that is what the Hill amendment is.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator refers to an idle gesture and a hollow shell, yet the Senator, a few moments ago, was talking about the tremendous wealth and the great value of the resources beyond the boundaries of the States. So, if there is great wealth—

Mr. HOLLAND. Has the Senator a question for me? If so, I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. Does not the Senator think there is tremendous wealth which would be of great assistance to the schools and to education in the United States, wealth that exists beyond the boundaries of the States, which could be used for education, if the Hill amendment were adopted?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; the Senator from Florida does not at all agree with the assumption of the Senator from Tennessee, because, in order for it to be used for the purposes of aid to education, in the first place, 3 years would have to elapse; and, in the second place, in the first place, 3 years would have to pass. The Senator from Florida has supported the passage of two aid-to-education bills on the floor of the Senate, and he has seen a complete failure of the passage of those bills by the House at a time, he believes, when his friend was a Member of the House. The House declined and failed to pass those particular measures.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to make it clear to the Senator from Florida that the Senator from Tennessee voted for the Federal aid-to-education bill, but the question involved there was whether \$300 million should be appropriated for Federal aid to education.

In this case the valuable resource is already present. The Hill amendment

directs that it be used for educational purposes. The only thing the Congress would have to do, if the Hill amendment were adopted, would be to adopt a formula for the use of the proceeds for educational purposes, which would be a very easy thing to do, if the fund were already available. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; the Senator from Florida does not agree. The Senator from Florida thinks that in all probability the Senator from Tennessee is still quite as much in the minority in the thinking of the House as he was when he was a Member, and when he says he voted for Federal aid to education in the House—which I am sure is true since he states it—but the bills dismally failed of passage in the House. The Senator from Florida has no late information indicating any change in the situation.

Mr. President, the Senator from Florida can speak from a background of having fought for Federal aid to education on the floor of the Senate at a time when it was a thoroughly controversial measure. The Senator from Florida fought for two different bills, both of which passed the Senate by a very respectable vote; and both of which, incidentally, were not passed by the House of Representatives.

In the course of one of the debates—and I take a little pride in this, because I should like to think the Senator from Alabama was as right in 1949 when he said those kind things, as he is now when he still says kind things about my attitude toward education—I had taken a strong stand for the measure which gave aid to the States in accordance with need, and the Senator from Alabama asked this question:

Mr. HILL. Is it not a fact that the Senator's great State enjoys the distinction, among the Southern States, of not being one of the low-income States? I wanted to emphasize that, for the reason that I was afraid that because the Senator's State is right in the very heart of the South, some people might think he was speaking because his State was one of the low-income States. The Senator's State is certainly about the average in the matter of income. Is that not true? So the Senator this afternoon is not speaking with any particular reference to his own State. He is speaking for the cause involved here. Is that not true?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I commend the Senator—

These are the priceless words which I cherish now as I cherished them then—

I commend the Senator. He is always so able in his presentations—

I do not want to appear immodest, Mr. President. I am quoting from my friend from Alabama, from his verdict on the attitude of the Senator from Florida on the subject—

and he now has put his finger on the very thing that is involved in the controversy now before the Senate.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I fought for that program, and the reason why I fought for it was because it was a program which had some bones and sinews in it. But

this empty shell to which we refer as the Hill amendment has neither bone nor sinew, because it is nothing in the world but a deferred promise which is going to mislead good people, and it should not be passed with any statements to the effect that here we have a Federal Aid-to-Education Act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot yield further.

We were talking about \$300 million; we were talking about aid to education, which, by the way gave nothing to my State except as it was given to New York or to California—a minimum amount. I was talking about a program for protecting the sovereignty of the States. There were three ways of handling this: First, limiting it to public schools; second, including public, parochial, and private schools; third, leaving it to the States under their own laws.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield in order that I may clarify the RECORD?

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot yield at this time. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will excuse me.

Mr. President, this is a very hollow promise, containing nothing but words which say that for 3 years, by further action of Congress, the proceeds can be given to national defense, and thereafter the money shall be given as grants-in-aid to education. It does not contain a word about protecting public schools; it does not contain a word about what should be done for parochial schools or private schools, or about devoting the moneys to need existing in the various States to be handled under State law; but, instead, it is a program which invites every kind of fight and every kind of controversy prevailing heretofore and which would again prevail before we get any legislation.

So, Mr. President, I am not willing to put this kind of a hollow pumpkin shell to use and say it is Federal aid to education. I do not care whether the money goes to education or where it goes if it goes to a good purpose. But it will take a great deal more than this to do the job. The annual revenue, at the maximum, would be less than \$100 million. We had \$300 million in our earlier bill which was to be devoted for a beginning of Federal aid to education. But I am not willing to say to the people that we have done something here when we have not done it. Neither am I willing, by taking a position tonight with the Senators supporting the Hill amendment, to delay and to procrastinate in the settlement of this question which is important to the Nation. There never was a time when it was as important as it is right now.

There are many other things I should like to say about this matter, Mr. President, but I close by simply inviting attention to one fact, namely, that the Senator from Alabama himself admitted that he had greatly softened—that was the word he used—his amendment. He meant he had taken out any reference to public schools, to parochial schools, to preserving State control, to giving aid to those States that need it in proportion to their need. He has taken out everything that

would give form and substance and meaning to the act and has left only this hollow, empty promise deferred for years. I am not willing to defer longer the settlement of this vital matter which is of such importance to the Nation.

Mr. President, I strongly hope the conference report will be soundly adopted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, since the Senator from Florida would not yield to me in the latter part of his remarks, I feel that I should make a few remarks to at least clarify the record.

It is quite apparent that those who are insisting upon the adoption of the conference report are unwilling to let the Members of the House of Representatives, if they can prevent it, have a vote on this very important issue. They must know, from the vigor of the fight they are presenting here, that the House of Representatives, like a majority of the Members of the Senate, would vote for the Hill amendment which provides for the use of the revenue for 3 years for the defense of the Nation, and, thereafter, as a great educational fund.

The Senator from Florida said the House had voted on this proposition several times previously. As a matter of fact, the House of Representatives has never voted on the question of whether it wants Federal aid to education.

I was mistaken a few minutes ago in stating that I had voted for Federal aid to education in the House. What I should have said is that I have been a sponsor of bills for Federal aid to education in the House on numerous occasions.

The fact is that there has been a very close division in House committee, so that Federal aid to education has never reached the House of Representatives for a vote.

The Senator from Florida is quite incorrect in saying that the House of Representatives has turned down, by substantial votes, bills providing for Federal aid to education. That has never happened. That issue has never reached the floor.

On many occasions a majority of the House, in one way or another, have indicated interest, but there has never been a vote in the House on the subject.

I cannot understand the reasoning of the Senator from Florida or of other Senators who are trying to ram this conference report through tonight. They do not want to give the House of Representatives an opportunity to vote on whether they want this newly found fund used, first, for national defense, for 3 years, and, next, as a great educational fund thereafter.

The Senator from Florida says he does not care what is done with the money; he does not care where it goes. So I cannot understand the position of the Senator from Florida. If he does not care where the money goes, why is he objecting to the House of Representatives at least voting on the issue?

The only thing I can think of that might be in the minds of those who are trying to ramrod the conference report through is that they do not want the great educational institutions and the people interested in education to have a hand in the fund, because they know they will protect it. They know

they will not be able to come to Congress in the future, saying, "Well, we have given the States the revenue derived from the submerged lands out to 3 miles—and 10½ miles in the case of Florida and Texas—and now we want you to extend the boundaries of the State and permit the money to be used for State purposes."

They know that if the educational interests of the United States see that the money is applied for the purpose of education, there will be substantial public opinion for seeing that it is applied there continuously, as has been the case of every special dedication to education.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] criticizes very bitterly the provisions of the Hill amendment, on the ground that the amendment does not prescribe whether the funds are to be used for parochial schools, public schools, or for other purposes. All the Hill amendment provides is a grant-in-aid to primary, secondary, and higher education.

I think it would have been very presumptuous on the part of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the co-sponsors of the amendment to have undertaken by this legislation to have spelled out exactly how the funds were to be used. The first thing to do is to establish a fund. Then I think Congress will have no trouble making provision for its use by way of grants-in-aid to States for primary, secondary, and higher education.

The need is great, and the demand is from every State in the Union. The salaries of teachers and facilities for schools demand that something be done. If the Senator from Florida has been so anxious to see Federal aid for education legislation enacted all these years, how can he now complain if the fund will be dedicated for that purpose?

Can anyone complain because the fund is to be used, for the first 3 years, for the defense of the United States? I do not think so. Those interested in education recognize that that is paramount. They are happy to wait the three years, to be procrastinated against for 3 years, with the understanding that after that period of time they will have the use of the funds.

This is a great opportunity to strike a telling blow in Congress for education, which, after all, differentiates the United States from many other nations. It is education which has enabled us to advance, to develop our resources, and to have the great form of Government we enjoy.

We know the need is great. I think the least we can do in the Senate is to give the Members of the House of Representatives, who, as we know, are just as much interested as we are, a chance to speak, not through the conference committee, which is not representative of the House, but through the House of Representatives itself. If the House of Representatives votes that it does not want this fund used for education, nothing else will be heard from many of us in the Senate. But, Mr. President, until the House of Representatives does speak, we shall entertain the opinion, based upon well-grounded facts, I am certain, that they fear defeat for the

sponsors of the conference report, that they know the House of Representatives will not stand by the conference report.

I should think the duty, at least on the part of the Senate conferees, is to insist that there be a vote on the amendment in the House, so that there can be an understanding and an agreement about what we are going to do with this valuable asset of the Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly in associating myself with the excellent remarks of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I realize that differences of opinion are strongly held among Members of the Senate with respect to the so-called Hill amendment, but I believe the record ought to be made quite clear as to exactly what the purpose of the Hill amendment is, rather than to brand it as a hollow pumpkin shell, or to say that it is without form or substance, or does not give an accurate description.

I can well imagine what might have happened in the Senate had the Hill amendment tried to spell out every detail as to how the money should be used. In fact, the Hill amendment did but one thing. It dedicated funds for specific purposes—for primary, secondary, and higher education. It left in the hands of Congress the formula or the standards which would be provided for the disposition of the funds, such as to the States, under State laws, or, as the Senator from Florida pointed out, for public, private, and parochial schools. I can well imagine that there would have been a storm of protest, and justifiably so, if on the Continental Shelf bill we had tried to develop substantive legislation, if we had tried to spell out every last detail as to who should receive the money.

But there are some useful purposes for which the funds might be used. I think those purposes, as has been noted, are highly desirable: First, for the defense of our country, because the budget, or a very little portion of the budget, I should say, is for purposes of defense. Availability of an amount which can be dedicated to defense purposes, and thereby reduce what is now a normal cost of government, should be welcome. Under the Hill amendment, that would be for a 3-year period.

There is simply no way to estimate how much will be needed for the cause of education in the days to come. One point needs to be emphasized. This is a growing country. The population of the United States is growing at the rate of 2,700,000 persons a year. By 1960 the population of the United States will be 175 million. By 1975, according to present estimates, the population will be more than 200 million. I can assure every Senator that with such a population growth, the need for additional school facilities and the need for additional schoolteachers will be tremendous.

For example, I have in my possession an editorial dated July 7, published in one of the local newspapers of my State, the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch. I believe the second paragraph of the editorial tells the story. It reads:

About a million additional children are being added to the school population each year, now and in the years through 1960.

Not nearly enough teachers are being trained to take charge of the necessary new classrooms—and there are not nearly enough classrooms in which to put the children. Such is the situation of the public schools across the country.

There is no question more pressing than that of education and educational facilities.

Just a word about returning the conference report to conference. It would not be unusual. I remind the Senate that last year we were in session all night on the independent offices appropriation bill conference report. That bill contained the funds for the atomic energy program, if I am correctly informed. I recall that twice the report was sent back to conference, because the Senate felt that the House conferees were being adamant in their position, and that if we accepted the conference report, the whole atomic energy program might be jeopardized. So the Senate twice sent the bill back to conference, and we did not worry because we might have to stay a little longer. The argument was that what the bill provided was important for the security of the country. After all the atomic energy program is vital to the welfare and defense of the Nation. We insisted that the House conferees give in and accept the Senate language. Our insistence met with success, and we came out with a good conference report.

The educational needs of the children of the United States are important to the national security. The Senate of the United States has no moral or political obligation to accept the wishes of the House conferees. Every time a report comes back on a subject with respect to which the Senate has taken a positive, definite action, by a yea-and-nay vote on a substantive policy matter, we are told that the House will not go along with the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This is an extremely important question, involving the dedication of this fund, whether it be for education or not. Is it not the rule of the House that on a conference report debate is limited to 1 hour to a side, so that if this report were sent back to be voted upon in the House, the total debate would be 1 hour to a side?

Mr. SPARKMAN. One hour altogether.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am reminded by my distinguished friend from Alabama that the total debate is 1 hour. Whether it be 1 hour or 2 hours, does not the Senator feel that the proponents of the conference report ought to be willing to risk 1 or 2 hours of debate to allow Members of the House to determine how they feel about this great issue?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do. I think the Senator from Tennessee has made his point crystal clear. I do not believe it is a point which has been appropriately or frankly answered in the debates this evening.

When the Senate has taken a firm position and said, "We will not yield on matters of basic policy," we have been able to carry the point and to win the case. Last year the Senate was in ses-

sion until 5 o'clock one Sunday morning. We sent the conference report on the independent offices bill back twice, on the question of the atomic energy program. Finally we got a report which, according to the Atomic Energy Commission, permitted the development of the atomic energy program along the lines which were necessary for the defense and security of the country.

Let me cite a more recent example. The other day in the Senate we debated the bill for the disposal of rubber plants. During the debate amendments were added to the committee bill. Committee bills are very important, but there is nothing sacred about a committee. Committees are not made up of bishops, deans of cathedrals, or other fine men of the clergy. They are composed of Senators—human beings. I have all the respect in the world for committees, but I know that many a committee bill has been amended on the floor of the Senate. Members of the Senate are very proud of some of their amendments.

The other day in connection with the rubber plant disposal bill the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] sponsored an amendment which we said was an important amendment. The committee was not for the amendment, but the amendment was adopted.

The distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] sponsored what I considered to be a very important amendment. The amendment was adopted. Those two amendments seemed so important that when the rubber plant disposal bill came back to the Senate from conference without those two amendments, the acting majority leader rose and said, "We cannot accept this conference report. Let us send it back to conference."

I have been informed today that, the bill having been sent back to conference, a conference report is coming back to the Senate with the Maybank amendment in it, which had been excluded once, and with the Long amendment in it. In other words, the Senate won its point when it stood up and said, "We are going to fight on the basis of principle. We are going to fight on the basis of the yea-and-nay votes, which have shown a majority in support of these principles."

As I have said before, there is nothing sacred about a conference report. Needless to say, at times conference reports involve compromises. There are many compromises in the conference report which came back on the Continental Shelf bill. But every time we have an opportunity to vote on a bill which involves a substantive issue, such as the Hill amendment on education, I think we ought to make every effort humanly possible to maintain our point and to enact the program for which we, as Members of the Senate, voted by a substantial majority.

I have nothing further to add. I express my hope that we shall maintain the Hill amendment. People all over the United States have supported this amendment. I know of no amendment to any bill which has had such wide support throughout the length and breadth of the land, among the rank and file of

the American people. The people of the Nation are concerned about our schools; and they have a right to be, because schools are close to their children and their homes.

It is not sufficient to say that we shall get around to this problem at some later date. Proposals for Federal aid to education have been under consideration in the Congress of the United States time after time. As the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] appropriately noted, there has not been a vote in the House of Representatives in recent years on the question of Federal aid to education of any kind. The question was bottled up in committee. Committees in Congress are mortuaries the like of which man has never known. There are many dead legislative bodies in committees. All the Senator from Tennessee is asking is that one of these forlorn souls shall have a chance to see the light of day and come to the floor of the House of Representatives and the floor of the Senate to be voted upon as legislation.

It is not sufficient to say that a measure has been referred to a committee. That is like saying that one goes to a railroad station, but he does not necessarily board the train. What we are interested in is results.

The Senator from Tennessee has made an argument which has not been set aside by any factual statement or any evidence to the contrary. I hope the Senate will insist upon its position, and that the Hill amendment will be retained in the conference report.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Overflowing Schools," and an article entitled "School Plight Studied," from the St. Paul Dispatch of July 7 issue of the same paper.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

OVERFLOWING SCHOOLS

One more concise summary of the plight of America's public schools has been made, this time at the Duluth branch of the University of Minnesota by Bernard A. Dawson, director of rural service for the National Education Association.

About a million additional children are being added to the school population each year, now and in the years through 1960. Not nearly enough teachers are being trained to take charge of the necessary new classrooms—and there are not nearly enough classrooms in which to put the children. Such is the situation of the public schools across the country.

A minimum of 100,000 new elementary school teachers will be needed each year through 1960, Mr. Dawson reports, and at least 50,000 new high-school teachers. Last year only 32,000 new elementary teachers were graduated from institutions of higher learning. There were 65,000 potential high-school teachers graduated but many of them went into elementary teaching or not into teaching at all.

School buildings containing 325,280 instruction rooms need to be built to bring the Nation's school system up to date on fulfilling enrollment needs and meeting minimum standards, Mr. Dawson says. The buildings would cost \$10 billion, of which local districts could supply only half under present bonding laws. That leaves a \$5 billion building fund shortage, without taking into ac-

count additional rooms needed in the next few years for the pyramiding enrollment.

Mr. Dawson recommends higher salaries for teachers and proper community appreciation of their status as means of enticing more young people into what should be regarded as a highly desirable profession. He sees no answer to the school-building crisis but eventual Federal grants in aid. And he appeals to citizens generally and to parents in particular to give support to school boards and educators who are trying to prevent a threatened deterioration of American public education.

SCHOOLS PLIGHT STUDIED

DULUTH.—Three factors have caused the current "plight" of public schools in the United States, a convocation of the University of Minnesota, Duluth branch, was informed today.

They are given as a shortage of qualified teachers, lack of adequate buildings and other physical facilities and unwarranted attacks on the character and integrity of the public school system and the persons in charge of it.

The convocation speaker, Howard A. Dawson of Washington, D. C., director of rural service for the National Education Association, declared that only a political upheaval which will clean out obstructionists and antisocial politicians at every level of Government can correct the situation.

Mr. Dawson called on young GI's and their wives to "kick out" these politicians and see to it that the people's government serves properly "the need of the youngest generation for schools, health facilities, and safety, at least, of life and limb."

He said such an upheaval may not come until "we have one or more major catastrophes resulting in the death or maiming of several scores of children."

Criticizing the qualifications of some teachers and housing conditions in some schools, Mr. Dawson added vehemently: "The schoolhouses are bursting at the seams and many schoolrooms have only baby sitters and policemen not teachers."

He called on parents, especially mothers, to stimulate the emotional drive necessary to generate public action for new school buildings and improvements, through local taxes and bond issues supplemented by State appropriations for grants to localities.

Among recommendations for relieving the teacher shortage he urged higher salaries, reduction in teacher load in the classrooms, a more democratic attitude toward teachers and more acceptance of teachers in the life of the community, organization of teacher preparatory classes in high schools and encouraging ablest students to enter them.

Then directing a blast at criticisms which he said aim to destroy public confidence in those who control the school system, Mr. Dawson concluded:

"The public should stop using the public schools as a whipping boy for every frustration that arises in American life. The current vicious attacks on the integrity of the schools discourages young people from entering the teaching profession."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KUCHEL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Bridges	Case
Anderson	Bush	Chavez
Barrett	Butler, Md.	Clements
Beall	Butler, Nebr.	Cooper
Bennett	Capehart	Cordon
Bricker	Carlson	Daniel

Dirksen	Jackson	Morse
Douglas	Jenner	Mundt
Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Ferguson	Kefauver	Payne
Flanders	Kennedy	Potter
Frear	Kilgore	Purtell
Fulbright	Knowland	Robertson
Gillette	Kuchel	Russell
Goldwater	Langer	Saltonstall
Gore	Lehman	Schoeppel
Green	Lennon	Smathers
Griswold	Long	Smith, Maine
Hayden	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Hendrickson	Malone	Sparkman
Hennings	Mansfield	Stennis
Hickenlooper	Martin	Symington
Hill	Maybank	Thye
Hoey	McCarran	Watkins
Holland	McCarthy	Welker
Humphrey	McClellan	Williams
Hunt	Millikin	
Ives	Monroney	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to reiterate what I believe to be the pertinent issue in the debate. It is a question of whether the Senate will adhere to the proposal which it adopted after considerable deliberation. The Hill amendment was offered as an amendment to two bills, the original, so-called tidelands bill and the Continental Shelf bill. It is my feeling that after all that labor and work, and after all the dedication and effort and conscientious activity that went into accomplishing the Hill amendment, we should sustain it on the conference report.

I firmly believe that if we lose this opportunity, we will not have a similar one for a long time to come. I would hope that we would not make that tragic mistake. It has taken us 3 years to get the amendment adopted, and I can safely predict that if we lose it now, it will take an equal length of time to retrieve it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not true that it would take only an hour in the House of Representatives to determine how the House feels about the amendment, and in that way we would know what the situation is?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. It would take only an hour for the House of Representatives to decide the issue. Then we would have an opportunity at least to know the view of the House of Representatives, not merely the view of the members of the conference committee.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to withhold it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I make the point of order that no business has been transacted since the last quorum call. I realize it is a technical matter, and any Senator could find some excuse for making it possible to have a quorum call. Unless a Senator wishes to undertake some dilatory tactics, I suggest we vote on the conference report. I inquire of the Chair what business has been transacted since the last quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained. No business has been transacted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will accept the conference report. As was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the conferees have brought back practically the whole Senate bill with the exception of one amendment. As a practical matter, if we were to send the report back to conference, and if it were rejected by the House, it would be merely an empty gesture. But we might end up with no Continental Shelf bill whatsoever enacted into law.

Under those circumstances it seems to me that in what I hope will be the closing days, at least of this session, the logical and the sensible thing for the Senate to do is to adopt the conference report.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I was one of the conferees on this measure. I simply wish to say that the conferees held 4 or 5 meetings. The Senate conferees worked diligently and tried to reach agreement. The House conferees, by an obvious position of 6 to 1, refused to take the matter back to the House of Representatives. Finally a majority of the Senate conferees had to ask themselves the question, "Shall we allow the wealth in the outer Continental Shelf to go unproduced, and put this matter in a condition of stalemate; or shall we bring the matter back to the Senate for decision?"

I am thoroughly convinced that nothing can be done to change the viewpoint of the House conferees.

So, Mr. President, I suggest that the conference report be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays and they were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is unavoidably detained on official business attending a meeting to extend price supports for light-weight wheat as the result of the rust situation in North Dakota. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent because of a death in his family, and if present would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—45

Barrett	Butler, Nebr.	Dworshak
Beall	Capehart	Eastland
Bennett	Carlson	Ellender
Bricker	Case	Ferguson
Bridges	Cordon	Flanders
Bush	Daniel	Goldwater
Butler, Md.	Dirksen	Griswold

Hendrickson
Hickenlooper
Hoey
Holland
Jenner
Knowland
Kuchel
Lennon

Long
Malone
Martin
McCarthy
Millikin
Payne
Potter
Purtell

Robertson
Saltonstall
Schoeppel
Smith, N. J.
Thye
Watkins
Welker
Williams

NAYS—43

Aiken
Anderson
Chavez
Clements
Cooper
Douglas
Frear
Fulbright
Gillette
Gore
Green
Hayden
Hennings
Hill
Humphrey

Hunt
Ives
Jackson
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Tex.
Johnston, S. C.
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kilgore
Langer
Lehman
Magnuson
Mansfield
Maybank
McCarran

McClellan
Monroney
Morse
Mundt
Murray
Neely
Pastore
Russell
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington

NOT VOTING—7

Byrd
Duff
George

Kerr	Young
Taft	
Wiley	

So the report was agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

STATEMENT ON NOMINATIONS REPORTED BY FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this afternoon there was reported to the Executive Calendar of the Senate a list of routine nominations to the Foreign Service. In order that the recommendations of the Committee on Foreign Relations may be understood with respect to these nominations I submit for the Record, on behalf of the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], a brief statement about the nominations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Earlier this afternoon the Foreign Relations Committee reported to the Senate a number of nominations in the Foreign Service of the United States. It will be noted that this list varies in certain respects from that transmitted to the Senate on July 22 by President Eisenhower. I should like to have the record show why the committee feels justified in deleting some 31 names from the original list.

There are three categories of officers involved. The first category of individuals concerns officers promoted from one grade to another within the Foreign Service. The second consists of members of the Foreign Service who have received new titles so that they may perform additional functions. The third consists of individuals who are being recommended for permanent appointments in the Foreign Service, either by way of transfer from the Foreign Service reserve or from outside the service.

In going over the list before us, the committee found that some of the nominees had not had a full FBI field investigation, although in every case some security check had been made—either by the Office of Se-

other Federal agencies. Immunity from taxation will be by virtue of the Constitution of the United States, as interpreted by the courts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

USE OF TRIBAL FUNDS OF UTE MOUNTAIN TRIBE OF INDIANS

The bill (H. R. 5328) to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRIBUTION OF MONEYS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

The bill (H. R. 1383) to provide for distribution of moneys of deceased restricted members of the Five Civilized Tribes, not exceeding \$500, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUBMISSION OF CLAIMS OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS TO THE COURT OF CLAIMS

The bill (S. 129) to amend the act of August 31, 1935 (40 Stat. 1049) authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin to submit claims to the Court of Claims was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso in section 3 of the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1049, 1050), entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin to submit claims to the Court of Claims," is hereby amended by deleting "5 percent" and by inserting in lieu thereof "10 percent."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the call of the calendar.

BI-STATE PARK—KENTUCKY AND VIRGINIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 81) granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the establishment of a bi-State park by the States of Kentucky and Virginia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the unfinished business before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business is Calendar No. 696, Senate Joint Resolution 81.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am now prepared to move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, unless Senators wish to insert matters in the Record.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota is very much interested in the next bill on the calendar, Calendar No. 691, a bill to confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes. When is that bill likely to be called up?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say for the information of the Senator, for the benefit of the two calendar committees, and of other Members of the Senate, that we shall have possibly two calendar calls tomorrow. I expect to complete the call from the point where we discontinued today to the end of the printed calendar of today on the first call. Then, depending on what our calendar looks like tomorrow, and whether or not the committee reports and bills are available—and I will consult with the two calendar committees—at the end of the day we may have a second calendar call. That may depend upon whether, in view of the developments tomorrow, we are likely to be still in session next week or not.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I assume that the distinguished acting majority leader would not call any bills on the calendar if the proper information were not available to the respective calendar committees.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. If a bill were to be passed on the call of the calendar, even though it had been reported from a committee, without either the bill or the printed report being available, the circumstances would have to be most unusual.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Has the acting majority leader given up as his target date for adjournment midnight July 31?

Mr. KNOWLAND. All I can say to the distinguished Senator from Florida is that the schedule which I had outlined as of last night can be completed, in my judgment, and we can coast into adjournment easily by tomorrow night, probably without even having to remain in session until midnight. However, in view of the developments of this morning, I wish to reserve judgment as to what the hour of adjournment or the date of adjournment may be.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Would the Senator welcome any assistance in arriving at a decision?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that I have notified the Secretary of State that in my judgment I shall not be able to leave with him on either Saturday or Sunday. We must reserve judgment as to what the situation may be next week.

VALIDITY OF THE SUBMERGED LANDS ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the attorney general of the State of Kansas has sent me a copy of a telegram which he addressed to the attorney general of the State of Texas. The correspondence concerns the action filed by the State of Arkansas, attacking the validity of the so-called tidelands bill recently enacted by the Congress.

This subject is so important, and the telegram to which I refer is so cogent, that I believe all Members of the Senate will be interested. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and telegram to which I refer may be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATE OF KANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Topeka, July 17, 1953.

Hon. PAT McCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: Enclosed is a copy of a telegram for your information which I sent to the Honorable John Ben Shepperd, attorney general of Texas, on July 13.

In view of the language used in the opinion in *United States v. California*, it would seem that neither the Federal courts nor agencies of the Federal Government can now legally litigate the tidelands bill on a constitutional basis.

This suit appears to have about as much basis either morally or legally, as if the State of Kansas were to file suit against the State of Montana, claiming its share of the undiscovered gold in the Rocky Mountains in that State. No doubt other suits will follow against the States of Louisiana and Texas. It seems to me that the advocates and supporters of the tidelands bill should commence now to win the battle of public opinion against the purposes of this suit.

I wish to assure you of my continued support and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD R. FATZER,
Attorney General.

TOPEKA, KANS., July 13, 1953.

Hon. JOHN BEN SHEPPERD,
Attorney General of Texas,
Austin, Tex.:

I am advised that the State of Arkansas has filed suit in the Federal district court of the District of Columbia, against Secretary of the Interior McKay, Secretary of Navy Anderson, and Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, seeking an adjudication of the invalidity of H. R. 4198, the tidelands bill, confirming and establishing the title of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries, recently passed Congress by overwhelming vote and signed by President Eisenhower. The tidelands bill was sponsored by the National Association of Attorneys General and since 1947 this association has gone on record by overwhelming vote at each annual convention as favoring the restoring of title to all submerged lands within historic boundaries of each of the several States. For over 150 years prior to decision of *U. S. v. California* in 1946, the Supreme Court of the United States had consistently held that title to all submerged lands within State boundaries was owned outright by each State. In the California case the Court held that tidelands within the boundaries of California were not owned by the State and that the United

States has paramount powers and rights therein. This decision overruled precedent 150 years old, and made it necessary that Congress determine and declare the ownership of submerged lands.

In the California case the Supreme Court of the United States said: "Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution (power of the United States) vests in Congress 'power to dispose of and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory of other property belonging to the United States.' We have said that the constitutional power of Congress in this respect is without limitation. (Citations omitted.) Thus neither the courts nor the executive agencies could proceed contrary to an act of Congress in this congressional area of national power."

It appears obvious that since the Supreme Court of the United States has said that neither the Federal courts nor the executive agencies of the Federal Government may proceed contrary to an act of Congress with respect to legislation enacted by it pertaining to territory or property belonging to the United States, the filing of this suit was motivated purely by political reasons and to rehash a controversy which has been settled by the representatives of all the people in the Congress of the United States.

HAROLD R. FATZER,
Attorney General of Kansas.

SALARY INCREASES FOR FEDERAL JUDGES AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a number of editorials, printed in various newspapers across the country, relating to my bill, S. 1663, to provide salary increases for Federal judges and Members of Congress. These editorials are uniformly favorable to the bill. Included in this group are editorials printed in newspapers in New Orleans, La., Belleville, Ill., Wausau, Wis., Hutchinson and Newton, Kans., Minneapolis, Minn., St. Louis, Mo., Kansas City, Mo., Des Moines and Sioux City, Iowa, Tiffin, Ohio, Elkhart, Ind., Fort Atkinson, Wis., and Fairmont, Minn.

Senators will recall that 2 or 3 weeks ago I asked leave to have a number of similar editorials printed in the RECORD, as an indication of the reaction which this bill is causing. Today, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials to which I have just referred may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Orleans States of June 11, 1953]

SALARY BILL

Members of Congress are in the strange position of wanting to be urged to pass legislation that would benefit themselves.

They need encouragement from the voters back home to pass Senate bill 1663, which would raise the salaries of themselves and the judges of United States courts and would make provision for increases, at the discretion of the attorney general, in the salaries of United States attorneys and their assistants.

The bill has been reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee. That committee's report presents convincing arguments in favor of its passage.

The salary increase for Members of Congress and for the Federal judges would amount to \$10,000, except for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, for whom the increase would be \$14,500.

It is pointed out in the report that the \$10,000 increase for members of Congress would bring the compensation to \$25,000, from which a Federal income tax of \$5,836 will be taken, leaving a net of \$19,164. This is a net gain of \$9,536 over the net salary of 1939. But when the increase in cost of living is considered, the proposed new salary arrangement would buy for a Member of Congress just about what his 1939 salary bought in that year.

An argument that the Federal judges are underpaid is emphasized by a comparison shown between the salaries they receive and those received by some State judges. At present the chief justice receives \$25,500; the chief judge of the court of appeals of New York receives \$35,000. Associate justices receive \$25,000; the associate judges of the court of appeals of New York receive \$32,500.

In the face of such compelling arguments in favor of the bill, however, there is a good chance Members of Congress will hesitate to pass it—unless they have assurance from the folks back home that they want the bill passed.

After all, this Congress is dedicated to economy, to cutting expenses. Members who expect to face voters in a year or two will feel that granting themselves a pay raise will be material their enemies could use against them.

As a matter of simple justice to public officials in highly responsible positions, we hope Congress realizes that the voters want those officials properly paid.

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News Herald of July 5, 1953]

JUDGES' PAY

The other day in his press conference President Eisenhower made the observation that, with taxes what they are, we are rapidly approaching the time when it will be difficult to get the best man to enter and remain in Government unless they have independent financial means. He was saying he believed that Government salaries should be raised so that the best-qualified people, poor or rich, could enter and stay in public life.

The American Bar Association agrees emphatically with that view. The association believes it is false economy—and dangerous to the country's future—if salaries are not realistic enough to attract the wisest and ablest men to assume the immense responsibilities of government.

Furthermore, we believe it would be entirely consistent with the President's program of Government economy if the Congress were to enact, at this session, the pending bill to increase by \$10,000 per year the salaries of United States judges and Members of Congress, and to authorize the Attorney General to establish district attorneys' salaries between \$12,000 and \$20,000 per year. The cost of such an increase would be a minute fraction of 1 percent of the Federal budget. We are confident the future benefits, in terms of better government, better administration of our courts and better enforcement of our criminal laws, would far outweigh the comparatively small cost. As one editor recently put it, higher pay could save billions at the cost of thousands.

Four years ago the Hoover Commission recommended substantial increases in Federal salaries in all branches—executive, legislative, and judicial.

This is not a partisan issue. Members of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, of both parties have approved the bill unanimously. Certainly the Hoover Commission study was nonpartisan. The pending bill has not been made a partisan target in any other quarter.

Sincerely,

ROBERT G. STOREY.

DALLAS.

[From the Belleville (Ill.) Advocate of July 1, 1953]

SALARY INCREASES FOR JUDGES, SENATORS, AND REPRESENTATIVES

United States Senate bill 1663 proposes a substantial salary increase for Members of Congress and United States judges.

The increase in each category, by terms of the bill, would be \$10,000 annually. The only exception is in the case of the Chief Justice of the United States, whose salary increase would be \$14,500, bringing his salary to \$40,000 annually.

Associate judges would receive \$35,000; United States circuit, court of claims, and custom patent appeal and military appeals court judges, \$27,500; United States district, customs court, and tax court judges, \$25,000.

The proposal, which has the endorsement of the American Bar Association, does not seem unreasonable.

In every instance the duties of office are of the utmost importance to our welfare.

To be sure, a higher salary does not necessarily mean better men will be named to the offices. But there is this to be said for it that men who have achieved outstanding success in their professions and business will find the offices more attractive.

There are many instances where men who seek congressional posts actually have no business or profession but depend upon politics for their existence. These have found any emoluments of office attractive.

Is it not possible that men and women who have been successful outside of politics would find being a Representative in Congress or a Senator worthwhile under such conditions? Not that they would make more money, but that they would at least be compensated in part for lending their energy and their talents to the enactment of legislation which so often falls under the spell of the mountebank.

It might even give them heart for the rigors of an election campaign.

Judges, of course, do not face this ordeal. Do not be deluded, however, that it is possible to buy talent and integrity in one package as you might get a double bargain in breakfast food and chewing gum.

Talent and integrity combined sell for only one price in the market place: The soul-satisfying conviction of the necessity for doing well whatever comes to hand, regardless of emoluments and honors.

[From the Wausau (Wis.) Daily Record-Herald of June 30, 1953]

A BETTER WAY

The manner in which the Senate Judiciary Committee proposes to increase the remuneration of the Nation's lawmakers is a much better and more straightforward way of doing it than that voted by the House.

The Senate group proposed raising the salaries of all Members from \$15,000 to \$25,000. The House voted to allow its Members to deduct from their taxable income the total cost of living expenses in Washington.

The purpose in either program is laudable. The job is an extremely important one and the remuneration should be adequate if not munificent. The \$25,000 salary suggested by judiciary group would give the lawmakers but slightly more purchasing power than the \$10,000 salary in effect in 1939, considering the great drop in the value of the dollar.

The public, however, would prefer that it be done openly and aboveboard, we believe, rather than through the device of avoiding taxes.

Presumably, the House preferred to be coy about the matter because of the economy drive. However, failure to provide proper compensation for the Nation's lawmakers is an instance of false economy. Increased pay for lawmakers and others in highly responsible positions in Government is consistent with the President's program of economy and has his support.

I think that is true. It has been perfectly obvious to a great many that, if we were not going to hold down appropriations, we would have to increase the debt limit. In my opinion, had a clear statement come to the Congress that it had better trim appropriation bills or be prepared to face an increase in the debt limit, there might have been somewhat different action on the part of Senators generally.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the acting majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, it so happens that the debt-limit problem does not grow out of the current appropriation bills. Actually the appropriations have been reduced by the administration and by the Congress, through cooperation on both sides of the aisle, by about \$13 billion less than the budget presented by former President Truman when we assembled here in January. The problem we face is the problem of the c. o. d. demands which are now coming in, with respect to tanks, planes, various kinds of equipment, and other things, which have been in the pipeline for a period of a year or 2 years, as the case may be. Those bills are coming due. The things which were ordered are delivered to the Government, and the people who manufactured them want their money. The question now arises whether they are going to be paid, or whether we are going to ask them to wait for payment by the Federal Government.

It is a basic policy decision the Congress may have to face. I quite agree with the distinguished Senator from Colorado, the chairman of the Finance Committee, that the question should be discussed, and certainly there is no desire on the part of the leadership on this side of the aisle to prevent its full and free discussion. I have canceled a trip, or at least I have notified the Secretary of State that I would be unable to make the trip with him, if he should leave on Sunday; and I doubt that I would be able to go with him, if he should leave on Monday. It may be that after consultations with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Georgia, and the Senator from New Jersey, who have been invited to go on this trip, to the Far East, we may all have to cancel the trip entirely, because I think the debt-limit question must be discussed, and that we must provide sufficient time for its discussion. I want the Senator to know that there will be ample time for discussion.

The question now arises whether the issue is to be met now, or whether the Congress will reassemble in September to decide it. It is a basic matter of policy. It may be that Senators will prefer to return in September or October, rather than meet the problem at this time. But I assume that both the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and the House, itself, will discuss the question.

I assume the Finance Committee is going to go into it for the purpose of ascertaining the facts, and I think our

decisions are going to have to be based on the realities of the situation. We cannot wish them away. We cannot indulge in wishful thinking regarding the situation. We shall have to face up to it, either now or later; and I assume that the proposal will be adequately discussed when it comes before us.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is probably true. I think it is too bad that the distinguished acting majority leader and our able minority leader may not be able to go on their trip at the time planned.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, informed the Senate that Messrs. Bow and RABAUT had been appointed additional managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6200) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 32. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, so as to increase to \$15 per day the maximum limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations;

S. 887. An act to permit the exchange and amendment of farm units on Federal irrigation projects, and for other purposes;

S. 1387. An act to amend section 508 (a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to expand the crop insurance program into additional counties; and

S. 2097. An act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the Eklutna project.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1402) to amend the Air Commerce Act of 1926, as amended, to authorize navigation of foreign, nontransport, civil aircraft in the United States through reciprocity and under regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 687. An act for the relief of Sister Walfreda (Anna Nelles), and Sister Amaltrudis (Gertrude Schneider);

H. R. 749. An act for the relief of Shui-Fook Fung;

H. R. 1129. An act for the relief of Katina Panagioti Fifiis and Theodore Panagiotou Fifiis;

H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Zia Edin Taheri and Frances Hakimzadeh Taheri;

H. R. 1516. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clemence De Ryck;

H. R. 1753. An act for the relief of Marigo Th. Tsipoura;

H. R. 2274. An act to further amend the act of May 26, 1948, entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to

extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2628. An act for the relief of Yulch Matsumoto;

H. R. 2839. An act to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public lands;

H. R. 2842. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 3045. An act for the relief of Nickolas K. Ioannides;

H. R. 3232. An act for the relief of Dennis F. Guthrie;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of John James T. Bell;

H. R. 3370. An act to amend section 25 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to include dependents in the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 4030. An act to repeal section 4 of the act of March 2, 1934, creating the Model Housing Board of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 4508. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 5552. An act for the relief of John Hatgeorge;

H. R. 5603. An act to amend the Federal Reserve Act so as to authorize national banking associations to make loans on forest tracts;

H. R. 5662. An act to amend the act of June 30, 1948, so as to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain public lands in Monroe County, Mich., held under color of title;

H. R. 6130. An act to permit a first preference for former owners of certain dwellings being sold under Lanham War Housing Act;

H. R. 6434. An act to amend sections 401 and 701 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to simplify the procedures governing the establishment of food standards;

H. R. 6649. An act for the relief of Eugene DeThassy; and

H. R. 6650. An act for the relief of Joseph Cerny.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1515. An act granting the consent of Congress to certain Western States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to enter into a compact relating to higher education in the Western States and establishing the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education;

S. 2277. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Italy and a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France;

H. R. 786. An act for the relief of Yusuf (Uash) Lazar;

H. R. 960. An act for the relief of Charles H. Lin (also known as Lin Chao Hsi);

H. R. 1383. An act to provide for distribution of moneys of deceased restricted members of the Five Civilized Tribes not exceeding \$500, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1456. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Susan Kay Burkhalter, a minor;

H. R. 1695. An act for the relief of Irene Prolos (nee Vagianos);

H. R. 2187. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Miki Tomono;

H. R. 2413. An act for the relief of Matsue Hashimoto;

H. R. 2603. An act for the relief of Carmela Daino Davenia;

H. R. 2604. An act for the relief of Lauri Allan Torn;.
 H. R. 3107. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain national-forest land in Basalt, Colo.;
 H. R. 3831. An act for the relief of Panagiotis G. Karras;
 H. R. 4424. An act for the relief of Eleonore Friedrich McAnelly;
 H. R. 4833. An act for the relief of Hormoz Mahmoud;
 H. R. 5134. An act to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes;
 H. R. 5257. An act to extend to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to narcotics;
 H. R. 5328. An act to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, and for other purposes;
 H. R. 5561. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act so as to provide that certain drugs which are or may be chemically synthesized shall be included within the classification of narcotic drugs;
 H. R. 6039. An act to amend section 47c of the National Defense Act;
 S. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949; and
 H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution establishing in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund within the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 687. An act for the relief of Sister Walfreda (Anna Nelles), and Sister Amaltrudis (Gertrude Schneider);
 H. R. 749. An act for the relief of Shui-Fook Fung;
 H. R. 1129. An act for the relief of Katina Panagioti Fililis and Theodore Panagiotou Fililis;
 H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Zia Edin Taheri and Frances Hakimzadeh Taheri;
 H. R. 1753. An act for the relief of Marigo Th. Tsipoura;
 H. R. 2628. An act for the relief of Yulchi Matsumoto;
 H. R. 3045. An act for the relief of Nickolas K. Ioannides;
 H. R. 3232. An act for the relief of Dennis F. Guthrie;
 H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of John James T. Bell;
 H. R. 5552. An act for the relief of John Hatgeorge;
 H. R. 6649. An act for the relief of Eugene DeThassy; and
 H. R. 6650. An act for the relief of Joseph Cerny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 H. R. 2274. An act to further amend the act of May 26, 1948, entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes; and
 H. R. 2842. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.
 H. R. 2839. An act to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public lands; and

H. R. 4030. An act to repeal section 4 of the act of March 2, 1934, creating the Model Housing Board of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3370. An act to amend section 25 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to include dependents in the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 4508. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 5603. An act to amend the Federal Reserve Act so as to authorize national banking associations to make loans on forest tracts; and

H. R. 5662. An act to amend the act of June 30, 1948, so as to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain public lands in Monroe County, Mich., held under color of title; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 6130. An act to permit a first preference for former owners of certain dwellings being sold under Lanham War Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6354. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to accept, operate, and maintain a certain defense housing facility at Cape May, N. J.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6434. An act to amend sections 401 and 701 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to simplify the procedures governing the establishment of food standards; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONSERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE NATION'S NATURAL RENEWABLE RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to the conservation and improvement of the Nation's natural renewable resources, which was read and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives.)

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, SIGN ENROLLED BILLS, AND SUBMIT COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate be permitted to receive messages from the House and from the executive branch of the Government, and that the Presiding Officer may be permitted to sign enrolled bills, and that committees may submit reports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Butler, Md.	Clements
Anderson	Butler, Nebr.	Cooper
Barrett	Byrd	Cordon
Beall	Capehart	Daniel
Bennett	Carlson	Dirksen
Bricker	Case	Douglas
Bush	Chavez	Duff

Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Ferguson	Kefauver	Payne
Frear	Kennedy	Potter
Fulbright	Kilgore	Purtell
George	Knowland	Robertson
Gillette	Kuchel	Russell
Goldwater	Langer	Saltonstall
Gore	Lehman	Schoeppel
Green	Lennon	Smathers
Griswold	Long	Smith, Maine
Hayden	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Hendrickson	Malone	Sparkman
Hennings	Mansfield	Stennis
Hickenlooper	Martin	Symington
Hill	Maybank	Thye
Hoey	McCarran	Watkins
Holland	McCarthy	Welker
Humphrey	McClellan	Wiley
Hunt	Millikin	Williams
Ives	Monroney	Young
Jackson	Morse	
Jenner	Mundt	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent because of a death in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

DEATH OF SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President and my colleagues of the Senate, the sad news has just come over the wire of the death of my colleague, the able leader of the majority. It is very difficult for me to express my feelings at this time.

Bob Taft and I started in political life in Ohio together about 1925. From that time to this, our association has been most intimate. We have thoroughly, completely, and harmoniously cooperated in doing the things we thought were in the best interests of the people of our State and our country.

We were candidates together first in 1938, when Senator Taft was elected to the Senate. We were in very close touch with each other during that term, when I served as Governor of the State of Ohio. Before that, he was chairman of his county committee when I served in a State office, and we were in intimate contact in that relationship. Throughout those 30 years of intimate and friendly relationship, our feelings for each other went far beyond the political field.

Bob Taft was an adornment to a great family name in Ohio and the Nation. Our State has been justly proud of him and of his services. It is impossible at this time for one to dwell on the various facets of his life and his services, but if I could characterize him in any single outstanding way today, it would be that he was a man of great and abiding faith. He had great faith in himself. His faith and confidence in himself was born of a great intellect, founded in a great spirit, and came from a vast and comprehensive experience in the field of public life.

Likewise he had great faith in his fellow men. I do not think there is a Member of the Senate who could not say that Bob Taft was his friend.

In him, I had a deep confidence. I could go to him for help when I needed it. He would approach my problems with me in a fair and friendly way.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TABER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6200) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GROSS and to include an article from a Baltimore newspaper.

Mr. DONOHUE in five instances.

Mr. PERKINS in two instances.

Mr. WIER and to include a telegram.

Mr. PRICE and to include an article from the American Legion magazine, notwithstanding it is estimated to cost \$196.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. PATTEN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEARNS on the anniversary of the first year of the constitution of the great Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. MATTHEWS in two instances and in one to include an article.

Mr. BENTSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BAILEY.

Mr. JENSEN.

Mr. OAKMAN and to include a letter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include a letter.

Mr. DORN of New York and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADAIR.

Mr. JAVITS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCUDDER and to include a resolution.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania and to include a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RADWAN.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POLK in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. YORTY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY and to include an article dealing with Air Force cuts which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$315.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi in connection with the cotton acreage bill.

Mr. DONOHUE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POAGE and to include an editorial.

Mr. STAGGERS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BONNER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. MORRISON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FERNANDEZ and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. ROBINO).

Mr. ROBINO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHENCK (at the request of Mr. McCULLOCH).

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include an address delivered by Speaker MARTIN.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 129. An act to amend the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1049), authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 171. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irma Benjamin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 179. An act for the relief of Insun Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 251. An act to amend section 1923 (a) of title 28, United States Code, relating to docket fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 303. An act for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 308. An act for the relief of Filolaos Tsolakis and his wife, Vassiliki Tsolakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 354. An act for the relief of Inger Larson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 506. An act for the relief of Horst F. W. Dittmar and Heinz Erik Dittmar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 671. An act to amend section 9 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 relating to the exemption of activities of the Atomic Energy Commission from State and local taxation; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

S. 743. An act for the relief of George P. Khouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1038. An act for the relief of Silva Galjevsek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1050. An act for the relief of Josephine Maria Riss Fang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1954. An act for the relief of Anthony N. Goraleb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1969. An act for the relief of Valda Cimmermanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2462. An act for the relief of T. K. Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to print copies of the report and hearings of a subcommittee on the Judiciary on "Subversive Influence in the Educational Process"; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution to print parts of the hearings and reports of a subcommittee on the Judiciary on "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments"; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 786. An act for the relief of Yusuf (Uash) Lazari;

H. R. 960. An act for the relief of Charles H. Lin (also known as Lin Chao Hsi);

H. R. 1393. An act to provide for distribution of moneys of deceased restricted members of the Five Civilized Tribes not exceeding \$500, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1456. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Susan Kay Burkhalter, a minor;

H. R. 1695. An act for the relief of Irene Proios (nee Vaglanos);

H. R. 2187. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Miki Tomono;

H. R. 2413. An act for the relief of Matsue Hashimoto;

H. R. 2603. An act for the relief of Carmela Daino Davenia;

H. R. 2604. An act for the relief of Lauri Allan Torn;

H. R. 3107. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain national forest land in Basalt, Colo.;

H. R. 3831. An act for the relief of Panagiotis G. Karras;

H. R. 4424. An act for the relief of Eleonore Friedrich McAnelly;

H. R. 4833. An act for the relief of Hormoz Mahmoud;

H. R. 5134. An act to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes;

H. R. 5257. An act to extend to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to narcotics;

H. R. 5328. An act to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5561. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act so as to provide that certain drugs which are or may be chemically synthesized shall be included within the classification of narcotic drugs;

H. R. 6039. An act to amend section 47c of the National Defense Act; and

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution establishing in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund within the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 52. An act for the relief of Anny Del Curto;

S. 61. An act for the relief of Hedwig Marek and Emma Elizabeth Marek;

S. 228. An act for the relief of Irene Ezlitis;

S. 312. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Orsi;

S. 561. An act for the relief of Charles Chardon Brooks;

S. 672. An act for the relief of Agostino Giusto;

S. 1366. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Montero;

S. 1442. An act to amend section 202 of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over persons and facilities engaged in the transmission or sale of electric energy to foreign countries;

S. 1515. An act granting the consent of Congress to certain western States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to enter into a compact relating to higher education in the western States and establishing the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education;

S. 1516. An act for the relief of Akemi Terada;

S. 1704. An act for the relief of Christina Pantellis Triantafili;

S. 2104. An act to authorize the payment of compensation to Clarence A. Beutel, formerly Deputy Administrator of the Recon-

purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. AIKEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2551. A bill to grant oil and gas in lands and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., to individual Indians in certain cases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHOEPPPEL (by request):

S. 2552. A bill to further amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to make a bulk purchase of certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2553. A bill for the relief of Joseph V. Crimi, father of the minor child, Joseph Crimi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 2554. A bill authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation to make loans to producers of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 2555. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver and other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2556. A bill to amend the charter of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, change its name, define its corporate powers, and provide for its organization and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 2557. A bill to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the conveyance and release by the Aztec Land & Cattle Co., Ltd., of its right, title, and interest in lands within the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forests, in the State of Arizona, and the payment to said company of the value of such lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2558. A bill for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 2559. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights";

S. 2560. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide for the selection of salaried attorneys to represent receivers and trustees in bankruptcy, and for other purposes;

S. 2561. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide for the selection of salaried receivers and trustees in bankruptcy, and for other purposes;

S. 2562. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to require United States attorneys to protect the interests of investors in enterprises involved in bankruptcy proceedings, and for other purposes; and

S. 2563. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to authorize intervention by or on behalf of investors in bankruptcy proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the last four above-mentioned

ills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FLANDERS (by request):

S. 2564. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Gubbins and Co., of Lima, Peru, and Renaldo Gubbins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 2565. A bill to freeze for a limited period of time rents and charges for housing accommodations owned by the Atomic Energy Commission at the levels prevailing on July 31, 1953; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2566. A bill for the relief of Jose Expectacion Montalvo; and

S. 2567. A bill for the relief of Bernardina Robles and Maria Elena Robles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2568. A bill to provide for the repair and restoration of the United States ship *Olympia*, flagship of Admiral Dewey at the Battle of Manila Bay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. MARTIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself and Mr. CASE):

S. 2569. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide for the disposition of revenues received under the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. NEELY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 2570. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2571. A bill providing for the establishment of the Robert A. Taft memorial scholarships for cancer research; ordered to lie on the table.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. MALONE):

S. 2572. A bill to provide Federal assistance for construction and reconstruction of a highway from the Nevada State line across the Sierra Nevada Mountains into the San Francisco Bay area; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 2573. A bill for the relief of Col. Samuel J. Adams, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 2574. A bill for the relief of Eliahu Lipkis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 2575. A bill to encourage the growth of small business, to increase productivity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2576. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations so as to provide additional compensation for the loss or loss of use of a lung as a result of service-incurred disability in time of war; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2577. A bill to increase the public debt limit by \$2,000,000,000; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2578. A bill for the relief of Joseph T. Hallock; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 2579. A bill to provide for the creation of an 11th judicial circuit to be comprised of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee To Investigate the Gold Mining Industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. HENNINGSON):

S. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

NATIONAL FOREST LANDS—SOIL CONSERVATION—FOOD ALLOTMENT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference three bills.

The first bill, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], would improve the national forest lands and administration. Briefly, it would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with those who lease national forest lands, for the improvement of such lands, and to reimburse those who make such improvements for the undepreciated part of the improvement in the event that the lease is canceled.

I ask unanimous consent to have the bill, together with an accompanying statement, printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2548) to facilitate the administration of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent thereon; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. THYE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall apply to the national forests and lands admin-

and the sentencing to imprisonment of some of the racketeers operating in Philadelphia.

In my judgment, the very brief and inexpensive investigations which were held by the special subcommittee which I established and of which I was chairman and the activities of which have now, by the action of the full Committee of Government Operations, been limited to a sixty-day period and to two localities, will be followed by the indictment and conviction of several extortionists in the City of Detroit and in Kansas City.

In my humble opinion, the action of the full committee, taken on July 15, was ill-advised and will result in drastically limiting my efforts to expose extortion, and hinder the prosecution of nationally known gangsters.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SECREST (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK).

Mr. McCORMACK in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. HAND in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. GWINN (at the request of Mr. RAY).

Mr. HRUSKA and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of Texas and to include an article.

Mr. YORTY (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEED.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE in four instances.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS.

Mr. ROONEY to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'KONSKI and to include some newspaper articles.

Mr. TALLE and to include a radio broadcast by Eric Severeid.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include extraneous material.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous material in one.

Mr. WESTLAND in two instances.

Mr. MACK of Washington and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSBEY and to include a table.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. SHELLEY and to include an article.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri and to include a newspaper article by Thomas L. Stokes, appearing in the Washington Star.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include a statement he made.

Mr. WILSON of California and to include a statement.

Mr. WARBURTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1754. An act for the relief of Dr. Manousos A. Petrolhelos;

H. R. 2458. An act to authorize the transfer of certain land located at Cherry Point, N. C., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3396. An act for the relief of Dr. Hamdi Akar;

H. R. 5728. An act to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5742. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949; and

H. R. 6185. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1397. An act relating to mining claims located on land with respect to which a permit or lease has been issued, or an application or offer for permit or lease has been made, under the mineral-leasing laws, or known to be valuable for minerals subject to disposition under the mineral-leasing laws, and for other purposes;

S. 2383. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact between the States of New Jersey and the State of New York known as the Waterfront Commission Compact, and for other purposes; and

S. 2491. An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for the Alaska Communication System, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House and a joint resolution of the following titles:

On July 30, 1953:

H. R. 5141. An act to dissolve the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to establish the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5246. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5256. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the retirement of judges of the Tax Court of the United States;

H. R. 5471. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5805. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5877. An act to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5989. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

On August 1, 1953:

H. R. 786. An act for the relief of Yusuf (Uash) Lazar;

H. R. 960. An act for the relief of Charles H. Lin (also known as Lin Chao Hsi);

H. R. 1383. An act to provide for distribution of moneys of deceased restricted members of the Five Civilized Tribes not exceeding \$500, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1456. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Susan Kay Burkhalter, a minor;

H. R. 1695. An act for the relief of Irene Proios (nee Vagianos);

H. R. 2187. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Miki Tomono;

H. R. 2413. An act for the relief of Matsue Hushimoto;

H. R. 2603. An act for the relief of Carmela Daino Davenia;

H. R. 2604. An act for the relief of Lauri Allan Torn;

H. R. 3107. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain national forest land in Basalt, Colo.;

H. R. 3831. An act for the relief of Panagiotis G. Karras;

H. R. 4424. An act for the relief of Eleonore Friedrich McAnelly;

H. R. 4833. An act for the relief of Hormoz Mahmoud;

H. R. 5134. An act to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes;

H. R. 5257. An act to extend to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to narcotics;

H. R. 5328. An act to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5561. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act so as to provide that certain drugs which are or may be chemically synthesized shall be included within the classification of narcotic drugs;

H. R. 6039. An act to amend section 47c of the National Defense Act; and

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution establishing in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund within the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TABER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6200) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 3, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

H. R. 4375. An act for the relief of Julia S. Criswell;

H. R. 4440. An act for the relief of Hilde Kretz Sforza;

H. R. 4483. An act to provide compensation to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of Indians for certain lands of the Riverton reclamation project within the ceded portion of the Wind River Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4508. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 4974. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4980. An act to amend section 3250 (1) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a person entitled to drawback with respect to certain nonbeverage products may elect to receive such drawback on a monthly instead of a quarterly basis;

H. R. 5118. An act for the relief of Louise Kaden and Elke Beate Kaden;

H. R. 5258. An act to authorize the sale of Army, Navy, and Air Force stores at military establishments to civilian employees of the Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5304. An act to permit members of the uniformed services to elect certain contingency options, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5470. An act for the relief of Salvatore Mario Veltri;

H. R. 5486. An act for the relief of Irene Andrews;

H. R. 5495. An act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5603. An act to amend the Federal Reserve Act so as to authorize national banking associations to make loans on forest tracts;

H. R. 5662. An act to amend the act of June 30, 1948, so as to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain public lands in Monroe County, Mich., held under color of title;

H. R. 5728. An act to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5740. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so as to protect the public health and welfare by providing certain authority for factory inspection, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5742. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949;

H. R. 5887. An act for the relief of George Michael Jabour;

H. R. 5951. An act for the relief of Eveline Brigitte Bartl (Eveline B. Hermann);

H. R. 6049. An act to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, to provide a temporary program of assistance in the construction of minimum school facilities in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6078. An act to amend Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress so as to make improvements in its provisions and extend its duration for a 2-year period, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6185. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preferences accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6200. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6252. An act to amend the charter of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America so as to limit membership on the National Council of Girl Scouts to citizens of the United States, to authorize meetings of the national council as provided in the constitution, and to authorize an annual report based upon the preceding fiscal year;

H. R. 6281. An act to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government-mail matter;

H. R. 6354. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to accept, operate, and maintain a certain defense housing facility at Cape May, N. J.;

H. R. 6382. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend until June 30, 1954, the period during which the General Services Administration may conduct negotiated sales of certain property;

H. R. 6391. An act making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6402. An act to provide for abatement of jeopardy assessments when jeopardy does not exist;

H. R. 6426. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend the time during which certain provisions relating to income and estate taxes shall apply, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6441. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of new ship construction, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6481. An act for the relief of certain refugees, and orphans, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6813. An act to authorize the utilization of a limited amount of storage space in Lake Texoma for the purpose of water supply for the city of Denison, Tex.;

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution for admitting the State of Ohio into the Union;

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution authorizing the recognition of the 200th anniversary of the founding of Columbia University in the city of New York and providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of this anniversary;

H. J. Res. 268. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the establishment of a bi-State park and/or recreational area by the States of Kentucky and Virginia;

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution granting a committee to assist in the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the Congress of 1754, held at Albany, N. Y., on June 24 of that year; and

H. J. Res. 325. Joint resolution to establish the date of the second regular session of the 83d Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the House, notified the Clerk of the House that, on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On August 1, 1953:

H. R. 2561. An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 by extending the time for filing certain claims thereunder, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3884. An act to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and continue offices in the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 4484. An act to amend section 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the

court out of assets of a decedent's estate for funeral expenses;

H. R. 5349. An act authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to W. C. Palmeyer and E. M. Cole;

H. R. 5804. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant easements for rights-of-way through, over, and under the parkway land along the line of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, and to authorize an exchange of lands with other Federal departments and agencies, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5905. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5969. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 293. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Third International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

On August 5, 1953:

H. R. 665. An act for the relief of N. A. G. L. Moerings, Mrs. Bertha Johanna Kravenbrink Moerings, and Lambertus Karel Aloysius Josef Moerings;

H. R. 1802. An act to amend the act of Congress approved March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214), as amended;

H. R. 1806. An act to amend further the Federal Register Act, as amended;

H. R. 1963. An act for the relief of Annelese Schillings;

H. R. 2564. An act to make the provisions of section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to injury to or interference with communications systems operated or controlled by the United States, applicable to and within the Canal Zone;

H. R. 3429. An act to amend clause (4) of section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 5016. An act to amend sections 502 (1) and 507 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in order to identify the drug known as aureomycin by its chemical name, chlortetracycline;

H. R. 5303. An act to amend sections 1606 and 1607 of the Internal Revenue Code in order to permit unemployment insurance coverage under State unemployment compensation laws for seamen employed on certain vessels operated by the United States;

H. R. 6571. An act amending the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the appointment of persons to exercise temporarily the duties of certain offices of the House of Representatives;

H. R. 4167. An act to create a Commission to be known as the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission;

H. R. 4974. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution creating a committee to assist in the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the Congress of 1754, held at Albany, N. Y., on June 24 of that year; and

H. J. Res. 325. Joint resolution to establish the date of the second regular session of the 83d Congress.

On August 6, 1953:

H. R. 4353. An act to increase farmer participation in ownership and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; to create a Federal Farm Credit Board; to abolish certain offices; to impose a franchise tax upon certain farm credit institutions; and for other purposes.

On August 7, 1953:

H. R. 660. An act for the relief of Akemi Terada;

H. R. 777. An act for the relief of Richard H. Backus;

H. R. 814. An act for the relief of Lt. Thomas C. Rooney and Mrs. Thomas C. Rooney, his wife;

H. P. 1329. An act for the relief of Arthur Oppenheimer, Jr., and Mrs. Jane Oppenheimer;

H. R. 1456. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Susan Kay Burkhalter, a minor;

H. R. 1459. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred G. Kates and Ronald Kates;

H. R. 1892. An act for the relief of Nicola, Lucia, and Rocco Fierro;

H. R. 2413. An act for the relief of Matsue Hashimoto;

H. R. 2602. An act for the relief of Elzbieta Grzymkowska Jarosz;

H. R. 2603. An act for the relief of Carmela Daino Davenia;

H. R. 2785. An act for the relief of Wera Fazio, a minor;

H. R. 2801. An act for the relief of David Zorub;

H. R. 2824. An act to encourage the discovery, development, and production of tungsten, manganese, chromite, mica, asbestos, beryl, and columbium-tantalum-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3276. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan;

H. R. 4152. An act to extend the time for exemption from income taxes for certain members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4424. An act for the relief of Eleonore Friedrich McAnelly;

H. R. 5134. An act to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands for certain purposes;

H. R. 5148. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5256. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the retirement of judges of the Tax Court of the United States;

H. R. 5495. An act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5728. An act to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5740. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so as to protect the public health and welfare by providing certain authority for factory inspection, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6200. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6391. An act making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6481. An act for the relief of certain refugees, and orphans, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 121. Joint Resolution for admitting the State of Ohio into the Union; and
H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution establishing in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund within the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

On August 8, 1953:

H. R. 937. An act for the relief of the estate of Frank DeNuzzi and Cecelia Melnik Burns;

H. R. 1524. An act to facilitate the management of the National Park System and miscellaneous areas administered in connection with that system, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1527. An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1880. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of northern Alaska for use as a mission school;

H. R. 2011. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for a campsite and other public purposes;

H. R. 2013. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Calvary Baptist Church, of Anchorage, Alaska, for use as a church site;

H. R. 2234. An act to amend the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers;

H. R. 2458. An act to authorize the transfer of certain land located at Cherry Point, N. C., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3107. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain national forest land in Basalt, Colo.;

H. R. 3480. An act to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 2 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title;

H. R. 3956. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands within the Santa Fe National Forest, N. Mex., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4305. An act to authorize additional appropriations for the lower San Joaquin River project;

H. R. 5257. An act to extend to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to narcotics;

H. R. 5258. An act to authorize the sale of Army, Navy, and Air Force stores at military establishments to civilian employees of the Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5304. An act to permit members of the uniformed services to elect certain contingency options, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5561. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act so as to provide that certain drugs which are or may be chemically synthesized shall be included within the classification of narcotic drugs;

H. R. 5636. An act to amend veterans regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for tuberculosis other than pulmonary;

H. R. 5742. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949;

H. R. 5877. An act to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6039. An act to amend section 47c of the National Defense Act;

H. R. 6049. An act to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, to provide a temporary program of assistance in the construction of minimum school facilities in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6078. An act to amend Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress so as to make improvements in its provisions and extend its duration for a 2-year period, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6354. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to accept, operate, and maintain a certain defense housing facility at Cape May, N. J.;

H. R. 6382. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend until June 30, 1954, the period during which the General Services Administration may conduct negotiated sales of surplus property; and

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution authorizing the recognition of the 200th anniversary of the founding of Columbia University in the city of New York and providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of this anniversary.

On August 12, 1953:

H. R. 786. An act for the relief of Yusuf (Uash) Lazar;

H. R. 960. An act for the relief of Charles H. Lin (also known as Lin Chao Hsi);

H. R. 1383. An act to provide for distribution of moneys of deceased restricted members of the Five Civilized Tribes not exceeding \$500, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1695. An act for the relief of Irene Prolos (nee Vagianos);

H. R. 2187. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Miki Tomono;

H. R. 2804. An act for the relief of Lauri Allan Tornli;

H. R. 3831. An act for the relief of Panagiotis G. Karras;

H. R. 4833. An act for the relief of Hormos Mahmoud; and

H. R. 5328. An act to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, and for other purposes.

On August 13, 1953:

H. R. 684. An act for the relief of Kim Jung Soo;

H. R. 723. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fumiko Sawai Skovran;

H. R. 728. An act for the relief of Helga G. Jordan and her son;

H. R. 812. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. India Taylor Palmi Stevenson;

H. R. 837. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. James D. Wilmet;

H. R. 871. An act for the relief of Orsola Jacopelli Leggio;

H. R. 917. An act for the relief of Luigi Lotito;

H. R. 953. An act for the relief of Jakabs Lenbergs;

H. R. 954. An act for the relief of Edith Smith;

H. R. 1124. An act for the relief of Gerda Goerauch;

H. R. 1629. An act for the relief of Miss Aiko Ikehara;

H. R. 1753. An act for the relief of Marigo Th. Tsipoura;

H. R. 1754. An act for the relief of Dr. Manousos A. Petroselos;

H. R. 1756. An act for the relief of Eugene de Thassy;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of Lee Lai Ha;

H. R. 2029. An act for the relief of Rose Maria Gradelone Calicchio;

H. R. 2816. An act for the relief of Sachiko Yuda;

H. R. 3035. An act for the relief of Stephanie Ziegler (Sister Benitia), Anna Hagel (Sister Clara), and Theresia Tuplinger (Sister Romana);

H. R. 3142. An act for the relief of Waltraut Benteler La Montagne;

H. R. 3223. An act for the relief of Gisela Korb (nee Unruh);

H. R. 3235. An act for the relief of Ruth Rumiko Fukano;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Hiroki Hollopeter;

H. R. 3360. An act for the relief of Yuriko Akimoto;

H. R. 3396. An act for the relief of Dr. Hamdi Akar;

H. R. 3526. An act for the relief of Josef Ablasmeler;

H. R. 3631. An act for the relief of Dorothy Sonya Goldschmidt;